DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 023 645 24 SP 001 883

By-Johnson, James A.
A National Survey of Student Teaching Programs. Final Report.
Northern Illinois Univ., De Kalb.
Spons Agency-Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Bureau of Research.
Bureau No-BR-6-8182
Pub Date Jul 68
Grant-OEG-3-7-068182-2635
Note-166p.
EDRS Price MF-$0.75 HC-$8.40
Descriptors-Accreditation (Institutions), Affiliated Schools, Analysis of Variance, *College Supervisors, Cooperating Teachers, Grants, Instructional Innovation, Internship Programs, *National Surveys, Private Schools, *Program Administration, Public Schools, Questionnaires, Student Teachers, *Student Teaching, *Teachers Colleges, Teaching Assistants

This document reports a survey study designed to collect rather comprehensive descriptive information on student teaching from 1,110 teacher education institutions in the United States. The data--received from 847 institutions (76 per cent) and tallied for each state and for the entire country--is presented in 53 tables accompanied by explanatory discussion. Categories of information include general background of the institutions, administration of student teaching programs, the college supervisor, the student teachers themselves, and cooperating school districts and cooperating teachers. There are sections on the results of (1) an analysis by variable between public and private institutions and between institutions that have received National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) accreditation and those that have not and (2) an analysis of the nonrespondents (A random sample of 10 per cent of them was visited). Conclusions, implications, and recommendations are presented, and the survey questionnaire is appended. With this document are four supplementary reports which elaborate (in the form of tables listing information by institution) on specific items in the questionnaire: No. 1--"Innovations in Student Teaching"; No. 2--"Student Teaching Research Grants"; No. 3--"Internship Programs"; No. 4--"The Use of Graduate Students to Supervise Student Teachers." (JS)

BR-6-8182
PA-24

FINAL REPORT

Project No. 6-8182
Grant No. OEG 3-7-068182-2635

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

A NATIONAL SURVEY OF STUDENT TEACHING PROGRAMS

JULY 1968

ED023643

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Office of Education
Bureau of Research

SP001883

A NATIONAL SURVEY OF STUDENT TEACHING PROGRAMS

Project No. 6-8182
Grant No. OEG 3-7-068182-2635

Dr. James A. Johnson

July, 1968

The research activity reported herein was performed pursuant to a grant with the Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their professional judgment in the conduct of the project. Points of view or opinions stated do not, therefore, necessari-16 represent official Office of Education position or policy.

Northern Illinois University

DeKalb, Illinois

Acknowledgments

The author wishes to thank Professors Dorothy McGeoch, L. O. Andrews, Donald Sharpe, Max Huebner, Elwyn Miller, Gwynn Greene, and Pete Abrams, who served as consultants on this project. A note of thanks is also extended to those in charge of student teaching programs throughout the United States who took the time necessary to fill out the lengthy survey instrument used in this study. A very special thanks for the gracious hospitality shown by those people in charge of the twenty-three student teaching programs that the author personally visited in connection with this project.

Jim Johnson

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

Acknowledgments ii
Table of Contents iii
List of Tables iv

INTRODUCTION 1

METHOD USED IN THE STUDY 1

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION OF THE STUDY 3

General Background of the Institutions 3
Administration of the Student Teaching Program 7
The College Supervisor 26
The Student Teachers Themselves 40
Cooperating School Districts and Cooperating Teachers 58

AN ANALYSIS BY VARIABLE 71

Nature of Control 71
NCATE Accreditation 78

AN ANALYSIS OF NONRESPONDENTS 84

CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS 85

SUMMARY OF THE STUDY 88

APPENDIX 91
The Survey Instrument 91

LIST OF TABLES

Table | Page

1. NUMBER OF TEACHER EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS PARTICIPATING IN STUDY--BY STATE AND NATION 4
2. NATURE OF CONTROL, ACCREDITATION, AND TYPE OF TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAM 5
3. FULL-TIME UNDERGRADUATE ENROLLMENT AND PER CENT OF UNDERGRADUATES PREPARING TO BE TEACHERS 6
4. TITLE OF PERSON IN CHARGE OF STUDENT TEACHING PROGRAM AND YEARS IN THAT POSITION 8
5. PER CENT OF TOTAL TIME ACTUALLY DEVOTED TO ADMINISTERING THE STUDENT TEACHING PROGRAM 10
6. ELEMENTARY STUDENT TEACHING: WHERE DONE, FULL OR PART TIME, AND NUMBER OF CREDITS 11
7. LENGTH OF ELEMENTARY STUDENT TEACHING ASSIGNMENT 12
8. SECONDARY STUDENT TEACHING: WHERE DONE, FULL OR PART TIME, AND NUMBER OF CREDITS 14
9. LENGTH OF SECONDARY STUDENT TEACHING ASSIGNMENT 15
10. TYPE OF SCHOOL IN WHICH STUDENT TEACHERS ARE PLACED 16
11. ADMISSION REQUIREMENTS FOR STUDENT TEACHING 18
12. PER CENT OF APPLICANTS DENIED ADMISSION TO STUDENT TEACHING 19
13. SUMMER STUDENT TEACHING: TYPE OF PROGRAM AND PLACEMENT OF STUDENT TEACHERS 20
14. STUDENT TEACHING LAW SUITS 22
15. STUDENT TEACHING BUDGET 23
16. INNOVATIONS AND RESEARCH IN STUDENT TEACHING 25

Table Page

17. USE OF THE CAMPUS LABORATORY SCHOOL IN PROFESSIONAL LABORATORY EXPERIENCES 27

18. INTERNSHIP PROGRAMS 28

19. MEAN NUMBER OF COLLEGE SUPERVISORS 29

20. COLLEGE SUPERVISORS: DEGREE STATUS AND TYPE USED IN SECONDARY STUDENT TEACHING PROGRAM 31

21. USE OF GRADUATE STUDENTS TO SUPERVISE STUDENT TEACHERS .. 32

22. AVERAGE NUMBER OF STUDENT TEACHERS ASSIGNED TO EACH FULL-TIME COLLEGE SUPERVISOR AT ANY ONE TIME 34

23. FREQUENCY OF COLLEGE SUPERVISOR VISITS TO EACH STUDENT TEACHER 35

24. RECOMMENDED RATIO OF FULL-TIME COLLEGE SUPERVISORS TO STUDENT TEACHERS 37

25. CHARACTERISTICS SOUGHT IN COLLEGE SUPERVISORS 38

26. COLLEGE SUPERVISORS HOLD JOINT APPOINTMENTS IN TWO DEPARTMENTS 39

27. STUDENT TEACHER ENROLLMENT DURING THE 1966-67 ACADEMIC SCHOOL YEAR 41

28. STUDENT TEACHER ENROLLMENT DURING 1967 SUMMER 42

29. TYPE OF GRADE USED FOR STUDENT TEACHING 43

30. RANK IMPORTANCE OF STUDENT TEACHER EVALUATORS 45

31. STUDENT TEACHERS: OBSERVATION PRIOR TO STUDENT TEACHING: CHOICE OF ASSIGNMENT: AND OPPORTUNITY TO TEACH DISADVANTAGED 46

32. PLACEMENT OF MORE THAN ONE STUDENT TEACHER IN A GIVEN CLASSROOM AT ANY ONE TIME 47

33. MEAN PER CENT OF STUDENT TEACHERS' TIME SPENT IN OBSERVATION, PARTICIPATION, AND ACTUAL TEACHING 48

34. MEAN PER CENT OF STUDENT TEACHERS FAILING FIRST ASSIGNMENT AND ALTERNATIVES AVAILABLE TO SUCH STUDENT TEACHERS 50

Table | Page

35. MEAN PER CENT OF STUDENT TEACHERS THAT FAIL STUDENT TEACHING AND ARE THEREBY ELIMINATED FROM TEACHER EDUCATION 51

36. MAJOR CAUSES OF STUDENT TEACHER FAILURE 52

37. USE OF THE STUDENT TEACHING CENTER CONCEPT AND NUMBER OF SUCH CENTERS 54

38. USE OF VIDEO-TAPE EQUIPMENT AND TAPE RECORDERS WITH STUDENT TEACHERS 55

39. USE OF MICRO-TEACHING AND THE SIMULATION TECHNIQUE PRIOR TO OR DURING STUDENT TEACHING 56

40. USE OF THE FLANDER'S INTERACTION ANALYSIS TECHNIQUE AND TABA'S TEACHING STRATEGIES MATERIAL DURING STUDENT TEACHING 57

41. USE OF BLOOM'S TAXONOMY OF EDUCATIONAL OBJECTIVES MATERIAL AND SENSITIVITY TRAINING WITH STUDENT TEACHERS 59

42. USE OF SMALL GROUP SEMINARS WITH STUDENT TEACHERS 60

43. WRITTEN CONTRACTS WITH COOPERATING SCHOOLS AND TOTAL NUMBER OF COOPERATING TEACHERS UTILIZED DURING 1966-67 SCHOOL YEAR 61

44. MEAN DISTANCE FROM CAMPUS THAT STUDENT TEACHERS ARE PLACED 63

45. METHODS USED TO TRAIN COOPERATING TEACHERS 64

46. CHARACTERISTICS SOUGHT IN COOPERATING TEACHERS 65

47. DEGREE OF SATISFACTION WITH COMPETENCY OF COOPERATING TEACHERS 66

48. POLICY CONCERNING PAYMENT TO COOPERATING SCHOOLS OR COOPERATING TEACHERS AND AMOUNT OF SUCH PAYMENT 68

49. BENEFITS PROVIDED FOR COOPERATING TEACHERS 69

50. PAYMENT TO BUILDING PRINCIPALS FOR PLACEMENT OF STUDENT TEACHERS IN THEIR BUILDINGS 70

Table Page

51. GRADUATE COURSE IN THE SUPERVISION OF STUDENT TEACHING .. 72

52. SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES BETWEEN PUBLIC AND PRIVATE INSTITUTIONS 73

53. SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES BETWEEN NCATE AND NON-NCATE INSTITUTIONS 79

INTRODUCTION

Student teaching, like most other phases of education, is currently undergoing considerable change. Furthermore, student teaching is enjoying a good deal of publicity--thanks to the attention paid to it by Dr. James B. Conant and other prominent educators. Unlike many other aspects of teacher education, however, student teaching seems to be rather universally accepted as an essential and even crucial part of teacher education. In light of this, it appeared that a study which would paint a clear picture of contemporary student teaching in the United States would be a timely contribution. Therefore, this study was undertaken with the financial help of the United States Office of Education (under the provisions of Public Law 531) and Northern Illinois University.

This study consisted of a survey of the current practices of student teaching programs in the United States. The main objective of the study was to clarify the current student teaching picture in the United States.

METHOD USED IN THE STUDY

A rather classical descriptive research design was used in this study. This design involved the following phases:

Phase 1. A survey of related literature was conducted, resulting in the compilation of a lengthy bibliography on the subject of student teaching.

Phase 2. A rough draft of the survey instrument was prepared by the project director.

Phase 3. Each of the seven consultants critiqued the rough draft of the survey instrument making suggestions for its improvement.

Phase 4. The survey instrument was revised on the basis of the consultants' suggestions.

Phase 5. The instrument was then pretested with a random sample of twenty teacher preparing institutions.

Phase 6. A final revision of the survey instrument was made based on the results of the pretesting.

Phase 7. On the 20th of November, 1967, the finished questionnaire was mailed to each teacher preparing institution in the United States. The mailing list was prepared from the annual *Education Directory--Part 3--Higher*

Education, which is prepared by the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Due to the organization of this directory, it was not always possible to determine precisely which institutions might have a student teaching program. For this reason, when there was doubt as to whether a certain institution might have a student teaching program or not, that institution was included on the mailing list. The mailing list included a total of 1,179 institutions. As a result of this first mailing, 673 completed questionnaires were returned.

Phase 8. On January 15, 1968, a second questionnaire was sent to each institution that had not yet responded. As a result of this second mailing, an additional 74 returns were received. This brought the total number of returns to 847.

Also, an additional 69 schools had by that time responded indicating they did not have a student teaching program. Subtracting this number from the original mailing list leaves an apparent total of 1,110 teaching preparing institutions in the United States (1,179-69=1,110). While this figure is obviously not precise, it is probably a very good approximation. There are probably a small number of nonrespondents that do not have student teaching programs; however, there are also probably a small number of new teacher preparing institutions that are not yet listed in the Higher Education Directory from which the original mailing list was made.

If one accepts the figure of 1,110 as the total number of teacher preparing institutions in the United States, then the 847 completed questionnaires received in this survey represents approximately 76% of all such institutions. The actual number of returns from each state or territory and from the entire United States are shown in table 1.

Phase 9. A random sample of twenty-three of the nonresponding schools were visited as part of an analysis of nonrespondents. This means that data were actually obtained from a grand total of 870 institutions--or approximately 79% of all teacher preparing institutions in the United States. (Parenthetically, an additional 19 returns were obtained too late for inclusion in the study.)

Phase 10. The information on the returned questionnaires was transferred to IBM cards. The cards were then tabulated and analyzed with electronic data processing equipment.

Phase 11. The final report was prepared and the results of the study were disseminated through a variety of channels.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION OF THE STUDY

The information gathered in this study is presented in a series of tables contained in this section. These tables show data for each state as well as for the entire United States. No returns were received in time for inclusion in the study from the Canal Zone, Delaware, Guam, Hawaii, Nevada, or Wyoming. For this reason, these states and territories do not appear on the tables. When viewing these tables, it should be noted that percentages do not always total 100% due to the fact that these values have been rounded off to whole numbers and due to the fact that some respondents did not answer all of the questions. It should also be noted that the figures given for the United States represent information for all of the responding institutions and not the average of all the states.

General Background of the Institution. The first section of the questionnaire dealt with the general background of the institution. Table 1 shows the number of teacher education institutions that participated in this study. This table shows this information broken down by public and private institutions for each state or territory and for the entire United States. As was mentioned, no returns were received in time for inclusion in the study from the Canal Zone, Delaware, Guam, Hawaii, Nevada or Wyoming.

Table 2 is entitled NATURE OF CONTROL, ACCREDITATION, AND TYPE OF TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAM. This table shows the proportion of public and private schools that responded in the study; the per cent of schools that have received regional accreditation as well as the per cent that have received NCATE accreditation; and the per cent of respondents having only elementary programs, only secondary programs, or both elementary and secondary programs.

Table 2 reveals that, of all the institutions in the United States that responded to this study, 36% are public institutions and 64% are private institutions. This table also shows that 93% of the responding schools have received regional accreditation (North Central, Middle States, New England, Northwest, Southern, or Western) and that 48% of these schools have received NCATE accreditation. Table 2 also indicates that 4% of the responding schools have only an elementary teacher education program, 9% have only a secondary teacher education program, and 87% have both an elementary and secondary teacher education program. This table also shows a break down of similar data for each state from which returns were received.

Table 3 shows the per cent of institutions with given full-time undergraduate enrollments and the per cent of undergraduates preparing to be teachers for each state as well as for the United States. For instance,

TABLE 1. NUMBER OF TEACHER EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS PARTICIPATING IN STUDY -- BY STATE AND NATION.

	Public	Private	Total
ALABAMA	10	6	18
ALASKA	1	1	2
ARIZONA	1	1	2
ARKANSAS	5	5	10
CALIFORNIA	12	26	38
COLORADO	6	5	11
CONNECTICUT	5	6	11
DIST. OF COL.	1	5	6
FLORIDA	5	8	13
GEORGIA	8	9	17
IDAHO	1	2	3
ILLINOIS	7	33	40
INDIANA	6	20	26
IOWA	3	23	26
KANSAS	6	12	18
KENTUCKY	6	9	15
LOUISIANA	9	5	14
MAINE	5	5	10
MARYLAND	5	11	16
MASSACHUSETTS	10	22	32
MICHIGAN	4	16	20
MINNESOTA	4	16	20
MISSISSIPPI	7	4	11
MISSOURI	6	14	20
MONTANA	3	3	6
NEBRASKA	5	8	14
NEW HAMPSHIRE	3	5	8
NEW JERSEY	6	9	15
NEW MEXICO	5	3	8
NEW YORK	16	41	58
NORTH CAROLINA	11	17	28
NORTH DAKOTA	6	2	8
OHIO	9	33	42
OKLAHOMA	9	4	13
OREGON	3	8	11
PENNSYLVANIA	16	45	61
PUERTO RICO	1	1	2
RHODE ISLAND	2	5	7
SOUTH CAROLINA	5	11	16
SOUTH DAKOTA	6	4	10
TENNESSEE	6	13	19
TEXAS	19	23	42
UTAH	3	3	6
VERMONT	4	4	8
VIRGINIA	7	8	15
WASHINGTON	4	9	13
WEST VIRGINIA	9	5	14
WISCONSIN	8	16	24
UNITED STATES	299	544	847*

* includes 4 schools not answering this item

TABLE 2. NATURE OF CONTROL, ACCREDITATION, AND TYPE OF TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAM.

	Nature of Control		Accreditation		Type of Teacher Ed. Program		
	Public	Private	Regional	NCATE	Elem.	Sec.	Both
ALABAMA	59%	35%	88%	47%	6%	0%	94%
ALASKA	50	50	100	0	0	0	100
ARIZONA	50	50	50	50	0	0	100
ARKANSAS	50	50	100	70	0	0	80
CALIFORNIA	32	68	97	24	5	5	90
COLORADO	55	46	100	64	0	9	91
CONNECTICUT	46	55	82	64	9	18	73
DIST. OF COL.	17	83	67	33	17	0	83
FLORIDA	39	62	100	39	0	8	92
GEORGIA	47	53	88	41	0	0	100
IDAHO	33	67	100	33	0	0	100
ILLINOIS	18	83	80	40	8	5	88
INDIANA	23	77	85	62	0	8	92
IOWA	12	87	92	50	0	8	92
KANSAS	33	67	100	61	0	0	100
KENTUCKY	40	60	100	60	0	0	100
LOUISIANA	64	36	93	57	0	0	100
MAINE	50	50	60	30	10	30	60
MARYLAND	31	69	94	31	0	6	94
MASSACHUSETTS	30	67	94	46	9	3	88
MICHIGAN	20	80	95	45	0	5	95
MINNESOTA	20	80	95	70	15	15	70
MISSISSIPPI	64	36	91	46	0	0	100
MISSOURI	30	70	100	50	10	5	85
MONTANA	50	50	100	50	17	17	67
NEBRASKA	36	57	100	86	0	0	100
NEW HAMPSHIRE	38	63	75	50	0	0	100
NEW JERSEY	40	60	93	47	0	33	67
NEW MEXICO	63	38	88	50	13	0	88
NEW YORK	28	71	91	47	10	19	71
NORTH CAROLINA	39	61	100	39	0	11	89
NORTH DAKOTA	75	25	88	63	0	13	88
OHIO	21	79	95	48	2	14	83
OKLAHOMA	69	31	100	77	0	0	100
OREGON	27	73	100	46	9	27	64
PENNSYLVANIA	26	74	97	38	0	21	49
PUERTO RICO	50	50	100	50	0	0	100
RHODE ISLAND	29	71	100	29	0	29	71
SOUTH CAROLINA	31	69	81	13	0	0	100
SOUTH DAKOTA	60	40	100	80	0	10	90
TENNESSEE	32	68	90	42	0	5	95
TEXAS	45	55	93	45	0	2	93
UTAH	50	50	100	83	0	0	100
VERMONT	50	50	100	13	25	13	63
VIRGINIA	47	53	87	33	0	0	100
WASHINGTON	31	62	100	85	0	0	100
WEST VIRGINIA	64	36	100	64	0	7	86
WISCONSIN	33	67	92	79	0	8	92
UNITED STATES	36%	64%	93%	48%	4%	9%	87%

TABLE 3. FULL-TIME UNDERGRADUATE ENROLLMENT AND PER CENT OF UNDERGRADUATES PREPARING TO BE TEACHER.

	Full-Time Undergraduate Enrollment									% of Undergrads. Preparing to be Teachers			
	0-499	500-999	1,000-2,999	3,000-4,999	5,000-9,999	10,000-14,999	15,000-19,999	20,000-29,999	30,000-above	0-25%	26-50%	51-75%	76-100%
ALABAMA	6%	12%	53%	6%	12%	6%	6%	0%	0%	24%	41%	24%	6%
ALASKA	50	0	50	0	0	0	0	0	0	50	50	0	0
ARIZONA	50	0	0	0	0	0	50	0	0	0	50	50	0
ARKANSAS	0	20	50	10	20	0	0	0	0	10	60	30	0
CALIFORNIA	8	18	42	5	16	5	3	0	0	68	18	11	0
COLORADO	0	18	36	18	9	9	0	9	0	46	36	9	9
CONNECTICUT	18	9	18	46	0	9	0	0	0	46	9	18	27
DIST. OF COL.	17	33	17	17	0	17	0	0	0	83	0	0	17
FLORIDA	8	15	46	8	15	8	0	0	0	23	46	15	15
GEORGIA	6	29	47	12	6	0	0	0	0	41	18	29	12
IDAHO	0	33	33	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	67	33	0
ILLINOIS	20	28	28	10	8	3	3	3	0	10	43	18	10
INDIANA	23	19	35	8	4	4	8	0	0	23	42	23	12
IOWA	4	46	35	0	4	8	4	0	0	15	42	35	8
KANSAS	0	67	0	11	11	11	0	0	0	28	39	33	0
KENTUCKY	13	20	40	0	20	7	0	0	0	7	47	27	20
LOUISIANA	7	7	21	21	36	7	0	0	0	29	64	0	7
MAINE	40	30	20	0	10	0	0	0	0	50	0	0	50
MARYLAND	19	56	13	6	0	0	0	6	0	50	31	0	19
MASSACHUSETTS	21	27	30	6	6		0	0	0	33	21	12	30
MICHIGAN	10	20	40	5	10	10	0	10	5	20	50	30	0
MINNESOTA	5	25	50	10	10	0	0	0	0	15	40	25	20
MISSISSIPPI	0	36	18	27	18	0	0	0	0	18	18	55	9
MISSOURI	15	35	15	5	30	0	0	0	0	20	35	30	15
MONTANA	17	50	0	17	17	0	0	0	0	17	33	17	33
NEBRASKA	14	21	36	21	0	0	7	0	0	21	36	21	21
NEW HAMPSHIRE	38	13	38	0	13	0	0	0	0	25	25	13	38
NEW JERSEY	13	27	7	53	0	0	0	0	0	40	13	13	33
NEW MEXICO	13	0	38	13	13	25	0	0	0	38	25	38	0
NEW YORK	12	15	29	22	14	5	2	0	0	50	21	21	5
NORTH CAROLINA	0	29	50	18	4	0	0	0	0	18	57	11	11
NORTH DAKOTA	13	38	25	13	13	0	0	0	0	13	38	0	50
OHIO	0	21	53	5	10	5	5	0	5	33	41	21	2
OKLAHOMA	0	15	39	15	15	15	0	0	0	23	31	31	15
OREGON	18	18	46	9	9	0	0	0	0	18	46	18	9
PENNSYLVANIA	7	23	46	15	7	2	0	2	0	46	23	12	18
PUERTO RICO	0	0	0	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	50	0	50
RHODE ISLAND	0	29	43	14	14	0	0	0	0	57	29	14	0
SOUTH CAROLINA	25	31	19	13	13	0	0	0	0	31	13	44	13
SOUTH DAKOTA	10	30	40	20	0	0	0	0	0	10	30	40	20
TENNESSEE	5	32	37	0	16	5	5	0	0	26	47	21	5
TEXAS	0	31	24	14	14	12	0	2	0	29	24	38	10
UTAH	0	17	17	0	33	17	0	17	0	50	50	0	0
VERMONT	13	50	25	13	0	0	0	0	0	50	0	25	13
VIRGINIA	0	40	33	20	7	0	0	0	0	33	27	13	27
WASHINGTON	8	8	54	8	8	8	0	8	0	31	54	15	0
WEST VIRGINIA	0	14	57	14	7	7	0	0	0	14	50	29	7
WISCONSIN	13	25	25	17	17	0	0	4	0	21	46	29	4
UNITED STATES	10%	26%	34%	12%	11%	4%	1%	1%	0%	32%	34%	21%	13%

this table shows that for the entire United States, 10% of the respondents have total full-time undergraduate enrollments of less than 500 students, 26% have full-time undergraduate enrollments of between 500 and 999 students, etc. It must be remembered when viewing this part of table 3 that these figures represent only the full-time undergraduate enrollments and not the total enrollments.

Table 3 also shows that, for the entire United States, 32% of the responding institutions have up to 25% of their undergraduates preparing to be teachers; 34% of the institutions have between 26% and 50% of their undergraduates preparing to be teachers; 21% of the institutions have from 51% to 75% of their undergraduates preparing to be teachers; and 13% of the institutions have from 76% to 100% of their undergraduates preparing to be teachers.

Administration of the Student Teaching Programs. Questions 8 through 26 on the questionnaire dealt with the administrative aspects of student teaching. This section of the final report presents the results of this portion of the questionnaire.

Table 4 deals with the title of the person in charge of the student teaching program and the number of years this person has been in that position. This table shows that 38% of the responding institutions have a Director of Student Teaching. It also shows that at 28% of the schools the Head of the Department of Education administers the student teacher program. At 4% of the institutions the student teaching program is administered by a Coordinator of Laboratory Experiences, while at 3% of the institutions this task is performed by the Dean of the College of Education. At 27% of the institutions the person who administers the student teaching program has some "other" title. Approximately 90 other titles were reported, the most frequent of these being, in order, Director of Teacher Education, Coordinator of Student Teaching, Director of Elementary and Secondary Education, Director of Professional Laboratory Experiences, Director of Teacher Training, Chairman of the Division of Education, and Coordinator of Student Teaching and Placement. Though not mentioned frequently, some of the more unusual titles for a person administering the student teaching program included Dean of the Graduate School, Coordinator of Clinical Experiences, Chairman of the Department of Curriculum and Instruction, Director of Student Personnel in Teacher Education, Associate Dean for Education Program, Director of Student Teaching-Placement and Follow Up, Assistant Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences, Coordinator of Teacher Institutes, Dean of Men, Dean of Instruction, and Director of the Office of Clinical Experiences for Teachers.

Table 4 also shows that, at 17% of the responding institutions, the person administering the student teaching program was in his or her first year in that position. At 16% of the schools this person had been in that

TABLE 4. TITLE OF PERSON IN CHARGE OF STUDENT TEACHING PROGRAM AND YEARS IN THAT POSITION.

	Title of Person in Charge of Student Teaching Program*					Number of Years in Position						
	1	2	3	4	5	0-1	1-2	3-4	5-10	11-15	16-20	20+
ALABAMA	41%	35%	12%	0%	12%	18%	24%	24%	29%	6%	0%	0%
ALASKA	0	0	0	0	100	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
ARIZONA	50	0	0	0	50	0	0	100	0	0	0	0
ARKANSAS	40	20	0	20	20	10	20	10	40	10	10	0
CALIFORNIA	18	34	5	3	40	16	18	11	37	16	3	0
COLORADO	27	18	18	0	36	27	9	27	36	0	0	0
CONNECTICUT	18	9	0	9	64	9	18	18	46	0	0	9
DIST. OF COL.	50	17	0	0	33	33	0	17	17	17	17	0
FLORIDA	46	23	0	0	31	39	8	31	23	0	0	0
GEORGIA	41	24	12	6	12	12	12	29	35	6	6	0
IDAHO	33	0	0	0	67	0	0	33	0	67	0	0
ILLINOIS	45	33	3	3	15	15	13	23	40	0	5	3
INDIANA	46	27	0	0	27	12	0	23	39	8	15	4
IOWA	31	50	4	0	15	15	15	15	35	12	8	0
KANSAS	28	50	0	0	22	17	28	22	11	11	6	6
KENTUCKY	53	13	0	0	33	20	27	27	13	7	0	7
LOUISIANA	64	0	0	0	36	21	21	36	14	0	0	7
MAINE	70	10	0	0	20	20	0	10	30	30	0	10
MARYLAND	25	31	6	0	38	12	19	19	6	38	0	6
MASSACHUSETTS	39	30	6	3	21	6	21	36	12	6	15	3
MICHIGAN	45	35	0	0	20	20	10	40	5	5	10	5
MINNESOTA	50	25	0	0	25	15	10	25	25	15	5	0
MISSISSIPPI	64	9	9	0	18	9	18	36	27	9	0	0
MISSOURI	30	35	0	0	35	30	10	15	20	5	5	10
MONTANA	50	33	0	17	0	17	17	17	50	0	0	0
NEBRASKA	43	36	7	0	14	14	29	21	29	7	0	0
NEW HAMPSHIRE	38	25	0	0	38	13	13	13	25	13	0	25
NEW JERSEY	47	27	0	0	27	70	7	13	40	13	7	0
NEW MEXICO	75	13	0	0	13	75	13	0	13	0	0	0
NEW YORK	26	22	9	2	41	21	19	23	17	7	5	7
NORTH CAROLINA	32	39	0	4	25	25	7	29	21	7	7	4
NORTH DAKOTA	75	13	0	0	13	13	25	38	13	13	0	0
OHIO	38	36	0	7	19	12	17	11	38	11	0	2
OKLAHOMA	62	15	0	0	23	8	31	23	31	8	0	0
OREGON	46	27	0	9	18	0	18	9	46	27	0	0
PENNSYLVANIA	35	43	0	0	23	13	12	20	23	18	10	2
PUERTO RICO	50	0	0	0	50	50	0	0	50	0	0	0
RHODE ISLAND	14	43	0	14	29	29	0	29	29	0	14	0
SOUTH CAROLINA	6	25	0	25	44	0	25	19	50	6	0	0
SOUTH DAKOTA	60	40	0	0	0	20	10	10	40	20	0	0
TENNESSEE	53	26	5	0	16	0	21	26	32	11	5	5
TEXAS	45	14	5	0	31	14	19	26	26	7	0	0
UTAH	7	0	17	0	67	33	0	33	17	0	17	0
VERMONT	38	13	0	0	50	13	0	38	38	13	0	0
VIRGINIA	33	27	7	7	27	20	20	13	27	13	7	0
WASHINGTON	46	15	8	8	23	15	31	15	15	23	0	0
WEST VIRGINIA	36	21	7	0	29	21	7	21	29	0	7	0
WISCONSIN	38	38	0	0	25	21	25	8	21	8	13	4
UNITED STATES	38%	28%	4%	3%	27%	17%	16%	22%	26%	10%	5%	3%

* 1. Director of Student Teaching
2. Head, Education Department
3. Coordinator of Laboratory Experiences
4. Dean, College of Education
5. other title

position for 1-2 years, at 22% of the schools for 3-4 years, at 26% of the schools for 5-10 years, at 10% of the schools for 11-15 years, at 5% of the schools for 16-20 years, and at 3% of the schools for 20 or more years.

Table 5 shows the per cent of time that the person who administers the student teaching program actually spends in this task (as opposed to supervising student teachers, teaching classes, other administrative duties, etc.). The table shows that, for the entire United States, at 22% of the institutions the person who administers the student teaching program devotes from 1% to 10% of his or her total time to administering the program; at 28% of the institutions from 11% to 25%; at 24% of the institutions from 26% to 50%; at 10% of the institutions from 51% to 75%, at 7% of the institutions from 76% to 90%; and at 7% of the institutions from 91% to 100%. Like all of the tables in this section, table 5 also shows the same information for each state and territory.

Table 6 shows the extent to which elementary student teaching is done on campus or off campus; the extent to which elementary student teaching is done on a full-time or part-time basis; and the mean number of quarter credit hours or semester credit hours awarded for elementary student teaching. This table shows that, for the entire United States, at 5% of the institutions elementary student teaching is done primarily on campus while at 82% of the institutions, elementary student teaching is done primarily off campus. (The remaining 13% of the institutions left this item blank. Presumably, most of these institutions do not have an elementary program.)

Table 6 also shows that, for the entire United States, 65% of the institutions have predominently full-time elementary student teaching while 22% have predominently part-time elementary student teaching.

Table 6 also indicates that, for those institutions throughout the United States on a quarter system, a mean of 13.78 quarter credits are awarded for elementary student teaching. Likewise, for institutions throughout the United States on a semester system, a mean of 7.97 semester credits are awarded for elementary student teaching.

Table 7 indicates the length of elementary student teaching assignments. This table shows that the mean length of the elementary student teaching assignment for the entire United States is 12.02 weeks. Table 7 also shows that, for the entire United States, at 1% of the institutions, elementary majors student teach one day per week; at 1% of the institutions, they student teach two days per week; at 1% of the institutions, three days per week; at 2% of the institutions, four days per week; and at 83% of the institutions, five days per week. (The other 12% of the responding institutions left this item blank and presumably have no elementary student teaching program.)

This table also shows that at 1% of the institutions, elementary student teachers devote one hour per day to student teaching; at 2%, two hours per day; at 11%, three hours; at 7% four hours; at 13%, five hours;

TABLE 5. PER CENT OF TOTAL TIME ACTUALLY DEVOTED TO ADMINISTERING THE STUDENT TEACHING PROGRAM.

	1-10%	11-25%	26-50%	51-75%	76-90%	91-100%
ALABAMA	6%	35%	35%	12%	6%	6%
ALASKA	100	0	0	0	0	0
ARIZONA	0	0	50	0	50	0
ARKANSAS	30	20	40	0	0	10
CALIFORNIA	40	18	21	11	3	3
COLORADO	27	18	9	18	9	18
CONNECTICUT	18	18	27	9	0	18
DIST. OF COL.	33	17	33	0	0	17
FLORIDA	8	39	23	15	8	8
GEORGIA	12	41	41	6	0	0
IDAHO	0	0	67	0	0	0
ILLINOIS	18	25	33	5	8	8
INDIANA	23	23	23	4	15	12
IOWA	23	31	23	12	12	0
KANSAS	33	39	11	0	11	6
KENTUCKY	7	20	33	27	7	7
LOUISIANA	21	36	29	0	7	7
MAINE	10	40	30	0	10	0
MARYLAND	31	19	19	19	13	0
MASSACHUSETTS	18	33	15	3	15	9
MICHIGAN	20	35	15	5	5	15
MINNESOTA	30	5	40	5	10	5
MISSISSIPPI	9	27	27	0	27	9
MISSOURI	25	35	10	10	10	5
MONTANA	17	33	0	17	33	0
NEBRASKA	21	29	29	21	0	0
NEW HAMPSHIRE	13	38	13	25	0	13
NEW JERSEY	20	13	7	20	13	27
NEW MEXICO	0	38	38	0	25	0
NEW YORK	14	21	26	12	3	21
NORTH CAROLINA	21	36	29	11	4	0
NORTH DAKOTA	13	13	37	13	0	25
OHIO	38	19	14	10	2	14
OKLAHOMA	39	15	23	23	0	0
OREGON	18	27	27	9	9	9
PENNSYLVANIA	23	33	18	9	4	7
PUERTO RICO	0	0	50	0	0	50
RHODE ISLAND	0	57	29	0	14	0
SOUTH CAROLINA	31	25	25	19	0	0
SOUTH DAKOTA	30	30	30	10	0	0
TENNESSEE	26	26	26	11	5	5
TEXAS	19	41	24	5	7	0
UTAH	0	33	33	33	0	0
VERMONT	25	50	0	0	0	13
VIRGINIA	47	13	20	13	7	0
WASHINGTON	23	31	15	15	0	15
WEST VIRGINIA	7	14	29	14	14	7
WISCONSIN	29	29	29	8	4	0
UNITED STATES	22%	28%	24%	10%	7%	7%

TABLE 6. ELEMENTARY STUDENT TEACHING: WHERE DONE, FULL-OR PART-TIME, AND NUMBER OF CREDITS.

	Where Done		Full- or Part-Time		Mean No. of Credits	
	On Campus	Off Campus	Full-Time	Part-Time	Quarter Hours	Semester Hours
ALABAMA	12%	82%	71%	24%	14.50	6.50
ALASKA	0	100	50	50	0.00	5.50
ARIZONA	0	100	100	0	0.00	7.00
ARKANSAS	0	100	80	20	0.00	8.22
CALIFORNIA	3	79	34	47	12.33	7.30
COLORADO	0	82	64	18	15.25	8.20
CONNECTICUT	18	55	73	9	0.00	7.78
DIST. OF COL.	33	50	83	0	0.00	8.00
FLORIDA	0	85	92	0	13.17	9.50
GEORGIA	0	100	94	6	13.50	7.00
IDAHO	0	100	100	0	0.00	7.00
ILLINOIS	5	90	63	33	13.00	6.50
INDIANA	8	81	73	12	13.25	8.68
IOWA	0	89	69	19	9.33	7.11
KANSAS	6	89	83	11	0.00	7.06
KENTUCKY	13	80	73	20	12.00	8.46
LOUISIANA	14	86	50	50	0.00	8.79
MAINE	10	40	40	10	0.00	10.00
MARYLAND	6	88	76	19	0.00	9.00
MASSACHUSETTS	18	79	70	24	10.00	8.77
MICHIGAN	10	85	50	45	13.33	7.13
MINNESOTA	10	70	80	15	12.57	8.50
MISSISSIPPI	9	91	73	27	10.50	6.00
MISSOURI	5	85	15	40	0.00	7.00
MONTANA	0	100	83	17	14.00	8.33
NEBRASKA	7	93	43	57	0.00	12.57
NEW HAMPSHIRE	13	75	88	0	0.00	9.14
NEW JERSEY	0	67	60	7	0.00	6.80
NEW MEXICO	13	88	50	38	15.00	6.14
NEW YORK	2	71	55	17	15.00	9.92
NORTH CAROLINA	4	82	86	0	15.00	6.43
NORTH DAKOTA	0	88	75	13	16.00	7.25
OHIO	0	83	57	24	13.09	10.28
OKLAHOMA	0	100	85	15	0.00	8.38
OREGON	9	46	46	9	15.00	9.67
PENNSYLVANIA	2	72	64	10	0.00	9.07
PUERTO RICO	0	100	50	50	0.00	5.00
RHODE ISLAND	0	71	43	29	0.00	11.00
SOUTH CAROLINA	0	94	81	13	0.00	6.13
SOUTH DAKOTA	0	90	90	0	0.00	7.22
TENNESSEE	0	84	68	21	14.50	7.31
TEXAS	7	86	52	41	0.00	5.95
UTAH	0	100	67	33	13.00	9.00
VERMONT	0	75	63	13	0.00	6.50
VIRGINIA	0	100	67	33	0.00	6.50
WASHINGTON	0	92	77	15	14.25	8.88
WEST VIRGINIA	0	93	71	21	0.00	6.33
WISCONSIN	8	88	71	25	15.00	8.48
UNITED STATES	5%	82%	65%	22%	13.78	7.97

TABLE 7. LENGTH OF ELEMENTARY STUDENT TEACHING ASSIGNMENT.

	Mean Length in Weeks	Days Per Week					Hours Per Day								Mean Total Clock Hours
		1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
ALABAMA	10.88	0%	0%	0%	0%	95%	6%	0%	12%	6%	0%	29%	35%	6%	287
ALASKA	9.00	0	0	0	0	100	0	0	0	0	50	50	0	0	250
ARIZONA	9.00	0	0	0	0	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	50	50	318
ARKANSAS	12.00	0	0	0	0	100	0	0	10	20	10	10	20	0	310
CALIFORNIA	15.27	0	0	3	8	68	3	8	16	21	13	13	3	3	290
COLORADO	10.67	0	0	0	0	82	0	9	9	0	36	18	0	9	274
CONNECTICUT	11.44	9	0	0	0	73	0	0	9	0	9	55	9	0	264
DIST. OF COL.	12.20	0	0	0	0	83	0	0	0	17	33	17	17	0	335
FLORIDA	10.17	0	0	0	0	92	0	0	0	0	15	31	31	15	324
GEORGIA	10.12	0	0	0	0	100	0	0	0	0	6	41	29	24	339
IDAHO	9.67	0	0	0	0	100	0	0	0	0	0	63	33	0	305
ILLINOIS	12.21	3	0	8	3	83	0	3	20	8	13	28	15	10	280
INDIANA	10.74	0	0	0	0	89	0	0	8	0	4	42	12	23	303
IOWA	9.65	0	0	0	0	89	0	0	15	4	4	31	12	23	267
KANSAS	9.47	0	0	0	0	94	0	0	6	6	11	56	17	0	262
KENTUCKY	12.29	0	0	0	0	93	0	0	13	13	13	40	13	0	294
LOUISIANA	16.93	0	0	0	0	100	0	0	29	14	7	43	7	0	380
MAINE	11.60	0	0	0	10	40	0	0	0	0	20	30	0	0	312
MARYLAND	10.67	0	0	0	6	88	0	0	6	0	31	25	19	13	285
MASSACHUSETTS	14.69	3	3	3	12	73	0	9	3	3	24	46	6	3	254
MICHIGAN	13.79	0	0	0	0	95	0	0	40	0	20	35	0	0	296
MINNESOTA	10.47	0	0	0	0	85	0	0	0	15	15	35	10	10	298
MISSISSIPPI	10.82	0	9	0	0	9	0	9	18	0	18	27	18	9	250
MISSOURI	13.44	0	5	0	10	75	0	5	25	10	0	35	5	10	262
MONTANA	10.67	0	0	0	0	100	0	0	0	17	0	83	0	0	293
NEBRASKA	15.29	0	0	0	0	100	0	0	29	36	0	29	0	7	322
NEW HAMPSHIRE	15.29	0	0	0	0	98	0	0	0	0	50	25	13	0	424
NEW JERSEY	8.50	0	0	0	0	67	7	0	0	0	20	33	7	0	222
NEW MEXICO	10.63	0	0	0	0	100	0	13	25	0	25	25	0	13	226
NEW YORK	15.29	2	0	0	2	67	0	0	9	5	21	26	9	3	368
NORTH CAROLINA	8.38	0	0	0	0	86	0	0	0	0	11	39	21	14	264
NORTH DAKOTA	10.57	0	0	0	0	88	0	0	13	0	25	13	13	25	257
OHIO	11.68	0	0	0	0	81	0	0	14	7	7	33	7	12	286
OKLAHOMA	10.00	0	0	0	0	100	0	0	6	8	8	46	31	8	304
OREGON	13.67	0	0	0	0	55	0	0	9	0	18	18	0	9	351
PENNSYLVANIA	12.80	0	0	0	2	72	0	2	0	3	15	43	7	5	356
PUERTO RICO	17.00	0	0	0	0	100	0	0	50	50	0	0	0	0	315
RHODE ISLAND	17.80	0	0	0	14	57	0	0	0	0	14	29	29	0	488
SOUTH CAROLINA	7.80	0	0	6	0	88	6	0	0	0	6	56	25	0	207
SOUTH DAKOTA	7.78	0	0	0	0	90	0	0	0	0	20	40	10	20	239
TENNESSEE	10.12	0	0	0	5	84	0	0	11	5	5	26	42	0	281
TEXAS	12.00	0	0	0	0	93	0	0	19	17	7	24	17	10	277
UTAH	13.83	0	0	0	17	83	0	0	0	33	0	17	33	17	358
VERMONT	8.83	0	0	0	0	75	0	13	0	13	13	25	13	0	245
VIRGINIA	12.60	0	7	0	0	93	0	20	7	0	13	33	27	0	257
WASHINGTON	11.75	0	0	0	0	92	0	0	15	0	31	23	15	8	303
WEST VIRGINIA	11.15	0	0	0	0	93	0	0	14	7	14	36	21	0	262
WISCONSIN	12.87	0	0	0	4	92	0	4	13	8	8	17	25	21	321
UNITED STATES	12.02	1%	1%	1%	2%	83%	1%	2%	11%	7%	13%	32%	14%	8%	297

at 32%, six hours; at 14%, seven hours and at 8%, eight hours. Lastly, table 7 indicates that, for the entire United States, the mean total number of clock hours spent in elementary student teaching is 297 hours. It should be noted that this figure represents the total clock hours spent in the entire student teaching assignment and not just the total hours spent in actually teaching the class.

Table 8 deals with secondary student teaching. This table shows, for instance, that 2% of the institutions in the United States have most of their secondary majors student teach on campus while 89% of the institutions have most of their secondary majors student teach off campus. Eight per cent of the respondents left this item blank probably because they have no secondary student teaching program. Table 8 also shows that at 60% of the institutions, secondary student teachers do full-time student teaching and at 31% of the institutions, secondary student teachers do part-time student teaching. Nine per cent of the respondents left this item blank. This table also shows that the mean number of quarter credits awarded for secondary student teaching by institutions on the quarter system is 13.18 credits. Likewise, the mean number of semester credits awarded for secondary student teaching by institutions on the semester plan is 7.20.

Table 9 indicates the length of secondary student teaching assignments. This table shows that the mean length of secondary student teaching assignments in the United States is 11.88 weeks. Table 9 indicates that at 1% of the institutions in the entire country, secondary majors student teach one day per week; at 1% of the institutions, two days per week; at 1%, three days per week; at 1%, four days per week; and at 89% of the institutions, five days per week. This same table shows that at 1% of the institutions, secondary student teachers devote one hour per day to student teaching; at 5%, two hours per day; at 17%, three hours per day; at 8%, four hours per day; at 12%, five hours per day; at 28%, six hours per day; at 13%, seven hours per day; and at 7%, eight hours per day. Lastly, table 9 indicates that the mean total clock hours devoted to secondary student teaching is 266 hours for the entire United States.

Table 10 shows the type of school in which student teachers are placed. For the entire United States, this table shows that 62% of the responding institutions place student teachers in public schools only; 2% place student teachers in private schools only; 30% place some student teachers in public schools and some in private schools; 1% place student teachers in the campus laboratory school only; and 5% checked the "other" category on this item. Almost all of the institutions that checked the "other" category indicated that they place some student teachers in the campus laboratory school and some in public schools.

TABLE 8. SECONDARY STUDENT TEACHING: WHERE DONE, FULL- OR PART-TIME, AND NUMBER OF CREDITS.

	Where Done		Full- or Part- Time		Mean No. of Credits	
	On Campus	Off Campus	Full-Time	Part-Time	Quarter Credits	Semester Credits
ALABAMA	0%	95%	71%	24%	14.50	10.91
ALASKA	0	100	50	50	0.00	7.00
ARIZONA	0	100	100	0	0.00	7.00
ARKANSAS	0	100	80	20	0.00	7.33
CALIFORNIA	0	87	16	71	10.50	6.09
COLORADO	0	91	55	36	15.20	7.20
CONNECTICUT	0	82	64	27	0.00	6.25
DIST. OF COL.	17	50	67	0	0.00	8.25
FLORIDA	0	85	92	0	13.17	9.60
GEORGIA	0	100	94	6	13.50	7.00
IDAHO	0	100	67	33	0.00	7.00
ILLINOIS	3	75	50	28	13.60	6.24
INDIANA	8	85	62	27	12.75	7.05
IOWA	0	96	62	35	9.33	7.27
KANSAS	6	89	72	22	0.00	6.59
KENTUCKY	13	80	60	33	12.00	8.08
LOUISIANA	0	100	21	79	0.00	7.36
MAINE	0	70	60	10	0.00	7.43
MARYLAND	0	100	88	13	0.00	7.25
MASSACHUSETTS	6	85	67	21	10.00	8.03
MICHIGAN	0	100	40	60	13.33	7.13
MINNESOTA	5	75	75	10	15.00	7.42
MISSISSIPPI	0	100	73	27	10.50	6.00
MISSOURI	0	85	40	45	0.00	6.24
MONTANA	0	100	67	33	11.33	6.67
NEBRASKA	0	100	50	50	8.00	9.00
NEW HAMPSHIRE	0	88	88	0	0.00	9.00
NEW JERSEY	0	100	88	0	0.00	6.80
NEW MEXICO	25	75	63	38	13.00	7.71
NEW YORK	0	83	47	36	15.00	6.96
NORTH CAROLINA	4	96	100	0	15.00	6.48
NORTH DAKOTA	0	100	88	13	15.00	7.75
OHIO	0	98	43	52	11.00	7.39
OKLAHOMA	0	100	85	15	0.00	8.31
OREGON	0	73	46	27	13.75	7.50
PENNSYLVANIA	0	95	69	25	9.00	7.84
PUERTO RICO	0	100	50	50	0.00	5.00
RHODE ISLAND	0	100	71	29	0.00	10.14
SOUTH CAROLINA	6	94	75	25	0.00	6.00
SOUTH DAKOTA	0	100	100	0	0.00	7.30
TENNESSEE	0	90	74	21	14.50	7.07
TEXAS	5	88	41	52	0.00	6.00
UTAH	0	100	67	33	12.00	7.10
VERMONT	0	63	50	13	0.00	5.20
VIRGINIA	0	100	47	53	0.00	6.53
WASHINGTON	0	85	62	23	14.25	8.71
WEST VIRGINIA	0	93	79	14	0.00	6.33
WISCONSIN	0	100	50	50	10.00	7.23
UNITED STATES	2%	89%	60%	31%	13.18	7.20

TABLE 9. LENGTH OF SECONDARY STUDENT TEACHING ASSIGNMENT.

	Mean Length in Weeks	Days Per Week					Hours Per Day								Mean Total Clock Hours
		1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
ALABAMA	10.81	0%	0%	0%	0%	95%	6%	0%	12%	6%	0%	29%	35%	6%	253
ALASKA	9.00	0	0	0	0	100	0	0	0	0	50	50	0	0	250
ARIZONA	9.00	0	0	0	0	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	50	50	338
ARKANSAS	11.20	0	0	0	0	100	0	0	10	10	10	20	20	0	278
CALIFORNIA	17.34	0	0	3	3	79	5	34	29	11	3	3	0	0	218
COLORADO	11.60	0	0	0	0	91	0	9	27	0	27	9	0	18	250
CONNECTICUT	14.00	9	0	0	0	82	9	9	0	0	9	55	9	0	219
DIST. OF COL.	12.25	0	0	0	0	67	0	0	0	17	33	17	0	0	328
FLORIDA	10.17	0	0	0	0	92	0	0	0	0	15	31	31	15	324
GEORGIA	10.12	0	0	0	0	100	0	0	0	0	6	47	24	24	336
IDAHO	9.67	0	0	0	0	100	0	0	33	0	0	33	33	0	248
ILLINOIS	10.74	3	0	3	0	73	0	0	8	15	8	25	13	8	265
INDIANA	10.04	0	0	0	0	92	0	0	19	4	8	35	8	19	262
IOWA	9.84	0	0	0	0	96	0	0	27	8	4	27	12	19	239
KANSAS	9.88	0	0	0	0	94	0	6	11	6	11	44	17	0	244
KENTUCKY	13.43	0	0	0	0	93	0	0	27	13	7	33	13	0	296
LOUISIANA	17.07	0	0	0	0	100	0	0	71	21	0	7	0	0	268
MAINE	9.29	0	0	0	10	60	0	0	0	0	10	40	20	0	263
MARYLAND	8.63	0	0	0	6	94	0	0	6	0	31	31	19	13	233
MASSACHUSETTS	13.20	3	3	0	6	76	0	6	6	0	21	46	6	3	233
MICHIGAN	14.05	0	0	0	0	100	0	0	45	5	20	30	0	0	294
MINNESOTA	10.65	0	0	0	0	85	0	0	50	20	10	30	15	3	292
MISSISSIPPI	10.82	0	9	0	0	91	0	9	18	0	18	27	18	9	250
MISSOURI	13.12	0	5	0	0	80	0	0	40	5	0	30	5	5	239
MONTANA	9.67	0	0	0	0	100	0	0	33	0	0	67	0	0	227
NEBRASKA	19.43	0	0	0	7	93	0	7	36	14	0	29	0	7	263
NEW HAMPSHIRE	16.14	0	0	0	0	88	0	0	0	0	50	25	13	0	450
NEW JERSEY	8.87	7	0	0	93	0	0	7	0	27	60	7	0	0	240
NEW MEXICO	12.75	13	0	0	0	88	13	25	25	0	13	13	0	13	203
NEW YORK	11.56	0	0	0	2	81	0	0	24	9	17	22	7	3	246
NORTH CAROLINA	8.43	0	0	0	0	100	0	0	0	0	11	43	29	18	268
NORTH DAKOTA	10.38	0	0	0	0	100	0	13	0	0	25	13	13	28	260
OHIO	12.80	0	0	2	0	93	0	10	14	21	10	24	5	10	247
OKLAHOMA	10.31	0	0	0	0	100	0	0	8	8	8	39	31	8	300
OREGON	13.75	0	0	0	0	73	0	9	18	0	9	36	0	0	291
PENNSYLVANIA	11.71	0	0	0	2	93	0	3	3	16	20	39	8	5	305
PUERTO RICO	17.00	0	0	0	0	100	0	0	50	50	0	0	0	0	315
RHODE ISLAND	15.57	0	0	0	0	100	0	0	0	0	29	29	29	14	431
SOUTH CAROLINA	8.06	0	0	0	0	100	13	6	0	0	13	38	31	0	192
SOUTH DAKOTA	7.80	0	0	0	0	100	0	0	0	10	10	50	10	20	235
TENNESSEE	10.83	0	0	0	5	90	0	0	11	16	5	16	42	5	286
TEXAS	13.05	0	0	0	0	93	0	0	43	7	5	19	10	10	265
UTAH	11.17	0	0	0	0	100	0	17	0	17	0	17	33	17	305
VERMONT	7.20	0	0	0	0	63	0	13	0	13	13	13	13	0	195
VIRGINIA	13.47	0	7	0	0	93	0	40	7	0	13	13	27	0	223
WASHINGTON	11.91	0	0	0	0	85	0	0	15	7	23	23	8	8	289
WEST VIRGINIA	11.00	0	0	0	0	93	0	0	14	0	14	43	21	0	267
WISCONSIN	13.54	0	0	0	0	100	0	13	25	13	4	17	17	13	279
UNITED STATES	11.88	1%	1%	1%	1%	89%	1%	5%	17%	8%	12%	28%	13%	7%	266

TABLE 10. TYPE OF SCHOOL IN WHICH STUDENT TEACHERS ARE PLACED.

	Public Schools Only	Private Schools Only	Public and Private Schools	Campus Lab. Schools Only	Others
ALABAMA	47%	0%	29%	0%	24%
ALASKA	100	0	0	0	0
ARIZONA	0	0	100	0	0
ARKANSAS	70	0	30	0	0
CALIFORNIA	74	3	16	0	5
COLORADO	55	0	46	0	0
CONNECTICUT	55	0	27	0	18
DIST. OF COL.	33	0	67	0	0
FLORIDA	85	0	15	0	0
GEORGIA	82	0	12	0	6
IDAHO	67	0	0	0	33
ILLINOIS	50	8	38	3	3
INDIANA	54	4	42	0	0
IOWA	50	0	50	0	0
KANSAS	50	0	50	0	0
KENTUCKY	40	0	53	0	27
LOUISIANA	50	0	29	0	21
MAINE	50	0	50	0	0
MARYLAND	50	6	31	0	13
MASSACHUSETTS	52	3	42	0	3
MICHIGAN	50	0	50	0	0
MINNESOTA	50	5	45	0	0
MISSISSIPPI	36	0	55	0	9
MISSOURI	30	10	45	0	15
MONTANA	33	17	50	0	0
NEBRASKA	50	7	43	0	0
NEW HAMPSHIRE	38	0	50	0	13
NEW JERSEY	93	0	7	0	0
NEW MEXICO	63	0	38	0	0
NEW YORK	67	3	22	0	7
NORTH CAROLINA	86	0	14	0	0
NORTH DAKOTA	25	0	75	0	0
OHIO	45	2	52	0	0
OKLAHOMA	77	0	23	0	0
OREGON	82	0	18	0	0
PENNSYLVANIA	80	0	16	0	3
PUERTO RICO	100	0	0	0	0
RHODE ISLAND	71	0	29	0	0
SOUTH CAROLINA	81	0	13	0	6
SOUTH DAKOTA	70	0	30	0	0
TENNESSEE	68	5	21	0	5
TEXAS	74	0	26	0	0
UTAH	67	0	17	0	17
VERMONT	75	0	25	0	0
VIRGINIA	87	0	13	0	0
WASHINGTON	69	0	31	0	0
WEST VIRGINIA	93	0	0	0	7
WISCONSIN	54	4	33	0	8
UNITED STATES	62%	2%	30%	1%	5%

Table 11 deals with the admission requirements for student teaching. This table shows that, for the entire country, 96% of the responding institutions include overall academic record as an admission requirement for student teaching; 82% include record in major field; 77% include record in professional education courses; 72% require a recommendation by adviser; 65% include some type of check on emotional stability; 60% include English proficiency; 60% include a check on physical fitness; 57% check on speech and voice; 54% check on personal-social-ethical fitness of the student; 29% check the students' hearing; 8% include extra-class activity; and 22% checked the "other" category on this item. There were approximately 90 different "other" requirements for admission to student teaching listed by various institutions. Among the more frequently listed of these were: recommendation by major department; record in minor field; recommendation by Dean of Students; and personal interview. Some of the more unusual requirements mentioned were: 100 clock hours of experience with youth; battery of psychological tests interpreted by a psychiatrist; SCAT test scores; appear before teacher selection committee; I.Q. test score; completion of 75% of course work in major; completion of non-credit audio-visual lab; membership in professional organization (SEA-NEA); MTAI score; handwriting; general culture test; 50%-ile in Ohio Psychological Test; and "no brushes with the law."

Table 12 indicates the per cent of applicants denied admission to student teaching. This table shows that, for the entire United States, 7% of the institutions admit all applicants to student teaching; 24% deny 0-1% of the applicants to student teaching; 21% deny 1-2% of the applicants; 16% deny 3-4% of the applicants; 14% deny 5-6% of the applicants; 5% deny 7-8% of the applicants; 6% deny 9-10% of the applicants; and 5% deny more than 10% of the applicants to student teaching. Many of the respondents indicated that they felt a considerable number of students did not bother to make formal application for student teaching knowing that they did not meet the requirements. If this is the case, that would mean that a greater number of students are being screened out of teacher education programs at the student teaching level than the figures in table 12 indicate.

Table 13 deals with summer student teaching programs. This table shows that 70% of the responding institutions in the country do not conduct summer student teaching programs. Table 13 also reveals that 5% of the institutions conduct summer student teaching for their regular undergraduates only; 12% conduct summer student teaching for experienced teachers only; and 8% conduct summer student teaching programs for both regular undergraduates and experienced teachers. Table 13 further shows 5% of the responding institutions indicated that they conducted other types of summer student teaching programs. Of these, the most frequently mentioned were: for graduate students only--experienced and inexperienced; special internship programs; and for unusual problem students.

TABLE 11. ADMISSION REQUIREMENTS FOR STUDENT TEACHING.

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
ALABAMA	100%	82%	82%	71%	53%	47%	29%	41%	35%	24%	12%	35%
ALASKA	100	50	100	50	50	0	100	0	50	0	0	0
ARIZONA	100	100	100	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	0	100
ARKANSAS	100	100	80	90	60	80	60	50	50	20	0	10
CALIFORNIA	95	82	76	76	76	92	90	76	76	53	13	40
COLORADO	91	100	100	82	64	82	73	73	73	27	18	18
CONNECTICUT	91	91	55	64	64	64	46	46	58	27	0	46
DIST. OF COL.	83	50	83	67	50	50	67	33	33	50	0	33
FLORIDA	100	85	85	62	62	39	54	46	54	15	0	23
GEORGIA	94	82	82	88	65	59	65	47	59	35	12	6
IDAHO	100	67	100	67	67	67	33	67	67	67	0	33
ILLINOIS	95	73	75	78	48	40	58	33	35	13	5	23
INDIANA	100	85	77	73	54	54	50	54	54	27	15	23
IOWA	100	81	65	85	85	65	62	69	77	46	8	35
KANSAS	100	94	72	94	89	78	83	72	72	22	11	72
KENTUCKY	100	87	93	80	67	53	67	53	53	20	7	0
LOUISIANA	100	100	100	71	79	86	86	71	64	64	14	29
MAINE	90	70	60	30	50	40	40	30	30	10	0	10
MARYLAND	88	75	81	63	56	75	56	50	63	25	6	19
MASSACHUSETTS	91	67	67	61	61	42	55	55	46	21	9	9
MICHIGAN	100	80	80	75	70	60	70	65	60	35	10	15
MINNESOTA	95	80	75	85	85	50	80	75	65	35	0	30
MISSISSIPPI	100	91	82	91	73	73	46	36	55	18	18	27
MISSOURI	100	80	80	75	75	65	80	65	65	40	5	30
MONTANA	100	100	100	67	50	33	83	50	50	50	0	17
NEBRASKA	100	86	86	100	71	64	57	50	50	14	7	14
NEW HAMPSHIRE	100	63	63	75	50	63	38	38	50	13	0	13
NEW JERSEY	93	93	87	60	73	60	53	60	67	33	13	13
NEW MEXICO	88	63	63	88	75	88	38	50	50	25	0	0
NEW YORK	98	79	71	55	60	43	53	74	41	28	5	17
NORTH CAROLINA	96	100	79	82	64	50	75	54	43	21	11	14
NORTH DAKOTA	88	75	75	75	38	63	50	38	25	13	0	38
OHIO	95	81	74	81	62	67	50	57	57	33	12	19
OKLAHOMA	100	92	62	92	69	85	54	54	54	31	0	23
OREGON	100	91	100	91	91	100	82	100	73	27	18	18
PENNSYLVANIA	97	84	71	69	69	48	54	57	59	34	12	16
PUERTO RICO	100	50	50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
RHODE ISLAND	100	29	43	14	29	14	29	57	43	0	0	14
SOUTH CAROLINA	100	81	81	75	75	56	69	50	63	25	13	13
SOUTH DAKOTA	100	80	90	80	50	80	60	70	40	20	0	30
TENNESSEE	95	79	84	79	58	63	58	42	53	16	0	21
TEXAS	95	86	91	67	67	67	62	50	60	62	7	26
UTAH	100	67	100	67	100	100	83	83	50	50	0	0
VERMONT	100	75	75	50	63	50	13	38	25	13	0	13
VIRGINIA	100	93	67	73	53	53	53	47	53	33	7	27
WASHINGTON	92	92	100	77	69	54	39	62	46	23	0	8
WEST VIRGINIA	100	100	100	57	57	86	50	57	50	43	14	36
WISCONSIN	96	79	79	63	63	63	83	67	67	38	4	29
UNITED STATES	96%	82%	77%	72%	65%	60%	60%	57%	54%	29%	8%	22%

1. Over-all academic record
2. Record in major field
3. Record in prof. ed. courses
4. Recommendation by adviser
5. Emotional stability
6. English proficiency
7. Physical fitness
8. Speech and voice
9. Personal-social-ethical fitness
10. Hearing
11. Extra-class activity
12. Other

TABLE 12. PER CENT OF APPLICANTS DENIED ADMISSION TO STUDENT TEACHING.

	None	0-1%	1-2%	3-4%	5-6%	7-8%	9-10%	10+%
ALABAMA	12%	24%	6%	18%	18%	6%	18%	0%
ALASKA	0	50	0	0	50	0	0	0
ARIZONA	50	0	50	0	0	0	0	0
ARKANSAS	0	0	20	10	40	20	10	0
CALIFORNIA	0	26	26	13	16	11	5	2
COLORADO	18	82	0	0	0	0	0	0
CONNECTICUT	9	9	18	18	27	0	0	9
DIST. OF COL.	33	17	33	0	0	0	0	0
FLORIDA	8	46	8	8	8	0	15	8
GEORGIA	12	12	35	29	6	0	6	0
IDAHO	0	33	0	33	33	0	0	0
ILLINOIS	5	20	15	20	18	10	8	3
INDIANA	0	31	19	27	4	8	0	4
IOWA	4	23	23	12	8	4	4	15
KANSAS	94	6	0	0	0	0	0	0
KENTUCKY	13	13	20	20	13	0	20	0
LOUISIANA	7	7	29	21	7	21	7	0
MAINE	50	20	0	10	10	0	10	0
MARYLAND	13	31	19	13	13	0	6	6
MASSACHUSETTS	18	36	12	21	0	6	3	3
MICHIGAN	0	20	30	5	25	5	0	0
MINNESOTA	15	20	15	5	15	10	10	10
MISSISSIPPI	0	27	18	9	9	27	0	9
MISSOURI	0	55	5	10	15	0	10	5
MONTANA	17	17	50	0	0	0	17	0
NEBRASKA	7	21	14	43	7	0	0	7
NEW HAMPSHIRE	0	63	13	0	13	0	13	0
NEW JERSEY	13	47	33	7	0	0	0	0
NEW MEXICO	0	25	13	0	13	0	25	13
NEW YORK	16	31	17	10	12	2	5	5
NORTH CAROLINA	4	7	21	21	21	4	11	7
NORTH DAKOTA	0	25	25	25	25	0	0	0
OHIO	5	21	24	14	17	5	7	5
OKLAHOMA	0	15	15	31	8	8	8	15
OREGON	0	27	0	46	18	0	9	0
PENNSYLVANIA	5	38	21	15	15	2	3	2
PUERTO RICO	50	0	0	50	0	0	0	0
RHODE ISLAND	0	43	29	0	0	0	0	0
SOUTH CAROLINA	0	25	31	19	13	0	6	6
SOUTH DAKOTA	0	20	30	10	20	0	10	10
TENNESSEE	5	26	26	16	11	5	0	11
TEXAS	7	12	24	14	17	2	12	10
UTAH	0	17	50	0	0	0	0	17
VERMONT	0	13	13	25	13	13	0	13
VIRGINIA	7	27	20	7	27	0	7	7
WASHINGTON	0	15	15	39	23	8	0	0
WEST VIRGINIA	0	14	7	14	29	7	7	14
WISCONSIN	4	25	29	13	17	4	14	0
UNITED STATES	7%	24%	21%	16%	14%	5%	6%	5%

TABLE 13. SUMMER STUDENT TEACHING: TYPE OF PROGRAM AND PLACEMENT OF STUDENT TEACHERS.

	Type of Program*					Placement of Student Teachers		
	1	2	3	4	5	Campus Lab. School Only	Surrounding Schools Only	Both Lab. and Surr. Schools
ALABAMA	38%	12%	41%	12%	0%	18%	41%	6%
ALASKA	50	0	0	50	0	0	0	0
ARIZONA	0	50	0	0	50	0	100	0
ARKANSAS	90	0	0	10	0	0	10	0
CALIFORNIA	47	5	3	24	18	0	50	5
COLORADO	82	0	9	9	0	0	9	9
CONNECTICUT	64	0	0	0	36	9	9	9
DIST. OF COL.	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
FLORIDA	85	0	8	0	8	8	8	0
GEORGIA	88	0	12	0	0	6	6	0
IDAHO	33	33	0	33	0	0	67	0
ILLINOIS	53	0	23	23	3	5	35	8
INDIANA	54	12	19	12	4	0	35	12
IOWA	62	4	15	15	4	8	27	4
KANSAS	67	0	17	11	6	6	17	6
KENTUCKY	27	0	47	13	13	7	40	13
LOUISIANA	93	0	0	0	7	0	0	0
MAINE	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
MARYLAND	81	6	0	0	13	0	19	0
MASSACHUSETTS	79	3	0	0	18	15	6	0
MICHIGAN	55	0	30	10	5	15	30	0
MINNESOTA	70	10	20	0	0	10	10	10
MISSISSIPPI	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
MISSOURI	55	5	20	15	5	15	20	15
MONTANA	33	33	17	17	0	0	50	17
NEBRASKA	64	7	0	21	7	21	14	0
NEW HAMPSHIRE	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
NEW JERSEY	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
NEW MEXICO	25	0	38	13	13	0	63	0
NEW YORK	93	3	2	2	0	2	5	0
NORTH CAROLINA	82	11	4	4	0	4	11	4
NORTH DAKOTA	38	0	25	13	25	13	13	25
OHIO	67	5	12	7	10	5	24	5
OKLAHOMA	77	0	8	15	0	0	23	0
OREGON	73	9	18	0	0	27	0	0
PENNSYLVANIA	77	9	2	10	3	3	16	2
PUERTO RICO	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
RHODE ISLAND	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SOUTH CAROLINA	81	6	6	6	0	13	0	0
SOUTH DAKOTA	50	10	30	0	0	10	30	0
TENNESSEE	42	21	16	21	0	26	26	5
TEXAS	95	0	5	0	0	2	2	0
UTAH	67	17	0	17	0	0	17	17
VERMONT	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
VIRGINIA	73	7	13	7	0	7	13	7
WASHINGTON	54	0	39	0	8	15	23	0
WEST VIRGINIA	36	7	36	7	7	21	29	14
WISCONSIN	54	0	33	13	0	25	13	8
UNITED STATES	70%	5%	12%	8%	5%	7%	18%	4%

*1. No summer student teaching
2. Program for regular undergraduates only
3. Program for experienced teachers only
4. Program for both 2 and 3
5. Other

Table 13 also shows that 7% of the institutions place their summer student teachers in the campus laboratory school; 18% place them in surrounding schools; and 4% place summer student teachers in both the campus laboratory school and surrounding schools. (The other 71% have no summer student teaching program or did not answer this particular item.)

Item number 17 on the questionnaire read, "To the best of your knowledge, has your student teaching program or have any of your student teachers ever been involved in a law suit growing out of any aspect of student teaching?" Respondents were given an opportunity to check "yes" or "no" to this question and then were directed, "If yes, please briefly state circumstances and outcome." Table 14 shows the number of institutions that answered "yes" to this item. These institutions were also asked to briefly state the circumstances and outcome of these law suits. The comments offered by institutions are as follows:

1. Student teacher accused of being a Communist. Student teacher sued her accuser and won her suit.
2. Car wreck while commuting to campus.
3. Student teacher sued co-operating school for damages. Student teacher arm burned in cafeteria accident. Outcome unknown.
4. An appeal to denial of admission to student teaching.
5. Two cases involving injury to a pupil and both cases defended by Local Board of Education.
6. Student driver, two passengers killed, manslaughter charge, student teacher driver cleared.
7. Drowning in pool. Case was dismissed, no fault found with student teacher.
8. Student didn't have professional characteristics to be a successful teacher. Court ruled in favor of university.
9. One physical education student teacher as a result of injury during demonstration.
10. Injury on school premises for which medical reimbursement required the normal legal action.

Other interesting comments offered by institutions included the following:

1. No law suits, but we have come close. Failure, drunkenness, misconduct with public school students. In all cases so far we have been in a position of strength.

2. No law suits. Threats of law suits against student teachers have been made--supposedly unpaid rent.

TABLE 14. STUDENT TEACHING LAW SUITS.

ALABAMA	1
CALIFORNIA	1
FLORIDA	1
IOWA	1
MINNESOTA	1
NEW JERSEY	2
NEW MEXICO	1
NEW YORK	1
NORTH DAKOTA	1
OHIO	1
TEXAS	1
UNITED STATES	12

Table 15 deals with financial aspects of student teaching. This table shows that 32% of the responding institutions could supply information relative to the total amount of the student teaching budget--68% could not. Table 15 also shows that the mean amount of the total student teaching budget, for all institutions that supplied such a figure, is $38,358. This figure, however, can be very misleading due to the fact that in nearly all cases, it does not include the salaries of college personnel working in the student teaching program.

Table 15 further shows that 28% of the institutions provided information on the cost of their student teaching program per student teacher. The mean amount of the cost per student teacher is $149. In nearly all cases, this figure does not include the cost of the salaries of college personnel working in the student teaching program. The approximate mean cost per student for institutions that reported a figure which included college personnel salaries is approximately $317.00 per student teacher.

Table 15 shows that 38% of the responding institutions assess a special student teaching fee upon the student teacher in addition to regular tuition charges. The table also shows that the mean amount of this special fee is $43.00.

TABLE 15. STUDENT TEACHING BUDGET.

	Total Amount of Student Teaching Budget		Cost Per Student Teacher		Assessment of Special S.T. Fee		1*
	Have such information	Mean Amount	Have such information	Mean Amount	Yes	Mean Amount	Yes
ALABAMA	24%	$114,560	12%	$211	47%	$28	12%
ALASKA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
ARIZONA	100	42,000	100	100	50	5	0
ARKANSAS	60	22,266	30	80	80	24	10
CALIFORNIA	18	18,501	24	158	40	47	5
COLORADO	27	24,627	46	188	18	45	9
CONNECTICUT	18	48,450	18	291	36	75	9
DIST. OF COL.	50	10,031	17	121	17	80	0
FLORIDA	23	36,283	23	96	8	65	0
GEORGIA	24	3,225	24	218	6	15	0
IDAHO	33	25,000	33	125	67	75	0
ILLINOIS	38	69,638	40	193	33	46	10
INDIANA	27	68,967	35	225	69	59	15
IOWA	42	50,389	27	64	65	48	15
KANSAS	56	14,192	44	49	44	28	6
KENTUCKY	47	45,248	27	241	53	69	7
LOUISIANA	64	56,743	43	186	29	71	7
MAINE	40	52,150	70	161	40	65	0
MARYLAND	38	45,625	38	78	50	53	6
MASSACHUSETTS	91	27,355	12	255	12	41	0
MICHIGAN	40	37,384	25	101	40	50	30
MINNESOTA	35	18,509	40	150	60	40	30
MISSISSIPPI	36	13,375	55	64	55	28	9
MISSOURI	20	29,450	15	163	15	42	10
MONTANA	50	21,750	17	100	50	68	0
NEBRASKA	14	43,006	21	147	29	39	7
NEW HAMPSHIRE	0	0	0	0	38	41	0
NEW JERSEY	33	28,340	40	92	73	60	0
NEW MEXICO	50	40,796	50	232	63	40	13
NEW YORK	26	43,170	14	212	5	37	7
NORTH CAROLINA	32	6,322	36	48	54	39	4
NORTH DAKOTA	50	25,950	63	111	25	35	0
OHIO	38	59,138	36	162	50	41	21
OKLAHOMA	23	21,716	31	265	0	0	0
OREGON	18	33,985	0	0	55	27	0
PENNSYLVANIA	30	52,265	18	277	43	53	7
PUERTO RICO	50	6,750	50	67	50	25	0
RHODE ISLAND	43	52,625	29	299	14	50	0
SOUTH CAROLINA	19	8,166	25	109	81	41	13
SOUTH DAKOTA	60	13,900	50	97	30	30	10
TENNESSEE	21	44,027	37	131	42	30	0
TEXAS	21	20,694	17	78	43	21	10
UTAH	33	12,100	33	101	100	38	33
VERMONT	38	7,633	25	250	13	0	0
VIRGINIA	67	16,395	67	107	7	30	20
WASHINGTON	54	88,241	46	145	46	27	0
WEST VIRGINIA	36	17,900	36	93	21	42	7
WISCONSIN	42	22,234	25	127	33	39	0
UNITED STATES	32%	$ 38,358	28%	$149	38%	$43	9%

*1. Institution Pays Cost of Transportation for Student Teacher

Finally table 15 shows that, for the entire United States, 9% of the responding institutions pay the cost of student transportation during student teaching.

The information gathered in this study on the financial aspects of student teaching is perhaps most meaningful when the data from each responding institution is studied by itself rather than viewing state and national statistics such as those presented in table 15. Unfortunately, due to the large number of institutions that took part in this study, space does not permit the inclusion of statistics on individual institutions in this report. However, anyone interested in receiving such information can do so by contacting the project director.

Table 16 deals with innovations and research in student teaching. This table shows that 45% of the responding institutions indicated that they had what they considered to be innovations in their student teaching programs. In all, there were approximately 260 different innovations listed. The most frequent of these, in order, were: use of video tapes with student teachers, team teaching, micro-teaching, professional semester, student teaching in disadvantaged areas, use of interaction analysis, and use of clinical professors. Though not mentioned frequently, some of the more unusual innovations mentioned included: cooperating teachers are hired as teaching associates to work with student teachers; student is assigned a public school teacher during semester preceding student teaching, so, in effect, works with cooperating teacher one full year; voluntary practicum in supervision of student teaching; public school advisory committee to student teaching program; elaborate pre student teaching professional laboratory experiences; matching of student teachers and cooperating teachers; use of simulation; student teachers assigned in team teaching and non-graded situations; I.B.M. card application; use of slide camera; outdoor education experience for all student teachers; 25% of student teachers have prior paid experience as teacher aids; use of daily student teaching log; no teaching at all during 9 weeks of student teaching; methods, guidance, and reading taught as part of student teaching; and each student teacher is assigned to a variety of schools.

When viewing the innovations listed by the various institutions, one must realize that what constitutes an innovation at one school might not be considered an innovation by another school. Space does not permit a listing of all innovations mentioned; however, additional data on this subject may be obtained upon request from the project director.

Table 16 also shows the actual number of institutions that have received student teaching research grants during the past two years. A total of 40 institutions indicated they had received such grants. Lastly, this table shows the mean amount of such grants. For the entire country,

TABLE 16. INNOVATIONS AND RESEARCH IN STUDENT TEACHING.

	Per Cent Having Innovations in S. T. Program	Number Receiving Student Teaching Research Grant in Past Two Years	Mean Amount of Grant
ALABAMA	29%	0	$ 0
ALASKA	50	0	0
ARIZONA	50	0	0
ARKANSAS	30	0	0
CALIFORNIA	47	1	103,800
COLORADO	55	2	30,000
CONNECTICUT	82	2	0
DIST. OF COL.	67	0	0
FLORIDA	54	1	4,900
GEORGIA	24	1	1,000
IDAHO	67	0	0
ILLINOIS	48	3	21,775
INDIANA	50	2	48,260
IOWA	35	0	0
KANSAS	56	2	4,225
KENTUCKY	47	0	0
LOUISIANA	57	0	0
MAINE	0	0	0
MARYLAND	31	1	0
MASSACHUSETTS	51	0	0
MICHIGAN	60	1	600
MINNESOTA	55	3	900
MISSISSIPPI	46	0	0
MISSOURI	40	0	0
MONTANA	67	0	0
NEBRASKA	36	1	135,000
NEW HAMPSHIRE	25	0	0
NEW JERSEY	33	0	0
NEW MEXICO	38	0	0
NEW YORK	49	5	30,180
NORTH CAROLINA	32	1	3,000
NORTH DAKOTA	25	1	0
OHIO	55	0	0
OKLAHOMA	39	0	0
OREGON	64	1	55,000
PENNSYLVANIA	39	3	32,000
PUERTO RICO	100	1	0
RHODE ISLAND	43	0	0
SOUTH CAROLINA	50	1	7,250
SOUTH DAKOTA	40	0	0
TENNESSEE	42	1	9,892
TEXAS	31	1	19,000
UTAH	67	0	0
VERMONT	38	0	0
VIRGINIA	33	0	0
WASHINGTON	69	1	5,000
WEST VIRGINIA	43	2	40,000
WISCONSIN	50	1	0
UNITED STATES	45%	40	$ 61,430

this figure is $61,430. It should be noted that some institutions indicated they received a grant but did not indicate the amount of the grant. Space does not permit a listing of individual research projects by amount, source of funds, title and institution, however, such information can be obtained from the project director.

Table 17 deals with the campus laboratory school and its use in professional laboratory experiences. This table shows, for one thing, that 23% of the responding institutions have a campus laboratory school. This table further shows that 19% of the institutions that have a campus laboratory school do not use it for providing professional laboratory experiences at all; while 26% of the institutions use it for observation and participation only. Table 17 also indicates that 6% of the institutions place only one student teacher in each room of the campus laboratory school each year; 17%, one student teacher per room each quarter or semester; 12%, two student teachers per room at the same time; 2%, three student teachers per room at the same time; 0%, four student teachers per room at the same time (4 institutions actually reported this practice but they constituted less than one half of one per cent); and 18% checked the "other" category on this item. The other 18% of the institutions that indicated they had a campus laboratory school did not indicate how it is used. Among the more frequently mentioned "other" uses of the campus laboratory school are: for remedial student teaching only; summer student teaching only; observation, participation and very limited student teaching; experimentation; and for foreign students only.

Table 18 shows the number and per cent of institutions having internship programs. This table shows that, for the entire country, a total of 192 institutions (22%) have some type of internship program. Nearly all of these internships are at the graduate level. The MAT (Master of Arts in Teaching) was the single most frequently mentioned type of internship program. Most of the internships reported are designed to prepare liberal arts graduates for teaching; however, a number of institutions have internships for educational specialists such as school administrators, counselors, etc.

The College Supervisor. Questions numbered 27 through 36 on the questionnaire dealt with the college supervisor. This section of the report presents the information obtained from these questions.

Table 19 shows the mean number of college supervisors by state and for the United States. This table indicates that, for all responding institutions, the mean number of full-time elementary college supervisors is 2.86; the mean number of part-time elementary college supervisors is 3.88; the mean number of total elementary college supervisors (both full-time and part-time) is 4.49; the mean number of full-time secondary college

TABLE 17. USE OF THE CAMPUS LABORATORY SCHOOL IN PROFESSIONAL LABORATORY EXPERIENCES.

	Have A Campus Lab. School	Use In Professional Lab. Experiences*							
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
ALABAMA	35%	0%	6%	0%	6%	18%	6%	0%	0%
ALASKA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
ARIZONA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
ARKANSAS	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
CALIFORNIA	21	5	8	3	5	0	0	0	5
COLORADO	9	18	9	0	0	0	0	0	0
CONNECTICUT	46	0	0	0	18	18	0	0	9
DIST. OF COL.	33	0	17	0	0	17	0	0	0
FLORIDA	31	8	23	0	0	0	0	8	0
GEORGIA	18	12	12	0	0	0	0	6	0
IDAHO	33	0	0	0	33	0	0	0	0
ILLINOIS	30	5	13	0	5	0	0	0	10
INDIANA	15	4	8	8	0	0	0	0	4
IOWA	8	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	4
KANSAS	11	6	11	0	0	0	0	0	0
KENTUCKY	40	7	0	0	20	0	0	0	20
LOUISIANA	43	0	7	0	7	21	0	0	0
MAINE	20	0	0	0	0	20	0	0	0
MARYLAND	38	0	25	0	6	6	0	0	0
MASSACHUSETTS	27	12	12	3	3	0	6	0	3
MICHIGAN	20	0	0	0	10	0	0	0	10
MINNESOTA	25	5	5	5	0	5	0	10	0
MISSISSIPPI	9	0	0	0	9	0	0	0	0
MISSOURI	35	0	10	0	10	5	0	0	10
MONTANA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
NEBRASKA	14	7	0	0	0	7	0	0	7
NEW HAMPSHIRE	25	0	0	25	0	0	0	0	0
NEW JERSEY	40	20	27	0	0	0	0	0	13
NEW MEXICO	25	0	13	0	0	0	0	0	0
NEW YORK	25	7	5	3	10	2	0	0	7
NORTH CAROLINA	11	11	0	4	0	0	0	0	4
NORTH DAKOTA	13	0	0	0	13	0	0	0	0
OHIO	14	5	10	0	2	50	0	0	0
OKLAHOMA	8	8	0	0	0	8	0	0	0
OREGON	18	0	0	0	0	9	0	0	9
PENNSYLVANIA	21	8	7	0	5	3	0	0	7
PUERTO RICO	50	0	50	0	0	0	0	0	0
RHODE ISLAND	14	14	14	0	0	0	0	0	0
SOUTH CAROLINA	25	6	6	6	0	0	0	0	13
SOUTH DAKOTA	20	0	10	0	0	10	0	0	0
TENNESSEE	32	5	16	5	16	0	0	0	0
TEXAS	7	10	0	0	7	0	0	0	0
UTAH	33	0	17	0	0	0	0	0	17
VERMONT	25	13	13	0	0	0	0	0	13
VIRGINIA	20	7	7	0	13	0	0	0	7
WASHINGTON	31	0	15	0	8	0	0	0	8
WEST VIRGINIA	14	0	7	0	0	7	0	0	0
WISCONSIN	37	0	13	4	4	17	0	0	0
UNITED STATES	23%	19%	26%	6%	17%	12%	2%	0%	18%

*1. Not used for Prof.Lab.Exp. at all
2. Observation and Part. only
3. One S.T.er./room/year
4. One S.T.er./room/qt. or sem.
5. Two S.T.ers./room at same time
6. Three S.T.ers./room at same time
7. Four S.T.ers./room at same time
8. Other

TABLE 18. INTERNSHIP PROGRAMS.

	Number of Institutions Having Internship Program	Per Cent of Institutions Having Internship Program
ALABAMA	0	0%
ALASKA	0	0
ARIZONA	0	0
ARKANSAS	1	10
CALIFORNIA	18	47
COLORADO	3	27
CONNECTICUT	5	46
DIST. OF COL.	2	33
FLORIDA	2	15
GEORGIA	5	29
IDAHO	0	0
ILLINOIS	8	20
INDIANA	5	19
IOWA	4	15
KANSAS	2	11
KENTUCKY	4	27
LOUISIANA	2	14
MAINE	1	10
MARYLAND	3	19
MASSACHUSETTS	7	21
MICHIGAN	5	25
MINNESOTA	4	20
MISSISSIPPI	0	0
MISSOURI	2	10
MONTANA	1	17
NEBRASKA	1	7
NEW HAMPSHIRE	1	13
NEW JERSEY	4	27
NEW MEXICO	3	38
NEW YORK	20	34
NORTH CAROLINA	6	21
NORTH DAKOTA	3	38
OHIO	12	29
OKLAHOMA	1	8
OREGON	5	46
PENNSYLVANIA	12	20
PUERTO RICO	1	50
RHODE ISLAND	2	29
SOUTH CAROLINA	2	13
SOUTH DAKOTA	1	10
TENNESSEE	2	11
TEXAS	3	7
UTAH	3	50
VERMONT	2	25
VIRGINIA	2	13
WASHINGTON	3	23
WEST VIRGINIA	2	14
WISCONSIN	10	42
UNITED STATES	192	22%

TABLE 19. MEAN NUMBER OF COLLEGE SUPERVISORS.

	Elementary			Secondary			Grand Totals		
	Full-Time	Part-Time	Total	Full-Time	Part-Time	Total	Full-Time	Part-Time	Total
ALABAMA	1.80	3.60	3.71	2.60	7.00	6.12	3.67	9.67	9.82
ALASKA	1.00	1.00	1.50	1.00	1.00	1.50	2.00	2.00	3.00
ARIZONA	0	11.50	11.50	0	24.00	24.00	0	35.50	35.50
ARKANSAS	2.14	3.50	2.90	4.00	4.57	6.67	5.38	6.67	8.90
CALIFORNIA	4.42	5.54	6.78	3.11	9.10	9.41	5.83	9.77	12.03
COLORADO	2.50	3.83	3.80	2.14	5.33	5.73	4.29	7.89	9.18
CONNECTICUT	13.33	5.43	8.67	6.50	9.00	9.30	13.17	11.50	15.55
DIST. OF COL.	1.50	4.00	3.67	1.50	7.00	6.20	2.25	8.80	8.83
FLORIDA	2.71	6.29	6.10	3.88	5.40	7.18	5.88	9.80	16.33
GEORGIA	1.55	2.10	2.53	1.71	2.00	2.29	2.64	3.55	4.67
IDAHO	1.00	4.50	3.33	1.00	9.50	6.67	2.00	14.00	10.00
ILLINOIS	3.83	2.36	3.75	3.61	6.21	6.83	5.83	7.21	9.35
INDIANA	2.00	2.87	3.14	3.82	5.45	6.57	5.47	7.59	10.38
IOWA	2.25	2.82	2.79	2.46	7.13	7.54	3.78	8.48	10.12
KANSAS	1.40	3.91	3.17	1.56	6.67	6.33	2.80	9.47	9.44
KENTUCKY	1.83	2.00	2.53	3.91	3.50	5.20	5.42	4.64	7.73
LOUISIANA	2.00	8.27	7.77	1.80	8.33	8.38	3.80	8.27	9.17
MAINE	1.50	3.43	4.29	1.00	5.50	4.50	1.50	6.33	6.60
MARYLAND	2.00	5.11	4.27	2.00	4.36	4.25	3.45	7.23	8.25
MASSACHUSETTS	6.36	3.54	5.23	5.17	6.45	6.69	9.43	9.00	11.44
MICHIGAN	4.69	3.65	6.47	7.36	4.50	8.10	10.14	7.53	13.65
MINNESOTA	3.14	3.60	4.50	2.86	3.83	4.81	5.40	5.86	8.30
MISSISSIPPI	2.25	2.25	3.00	2.00	5.43	6.00	4.75	7.00	8.33
MISSOURI	1.54	2.69	2.89	3.42	6.58	6.67	4.29	7.13	8.70
MONTANA	1.00	3.80	3.67	1.33	4.67	5.33	2.33	7.83	9.00
NEBRASKA	2.73	3.00	3.64	4.42	6.00	7.64	6.92	8.33	11.29
NEW HAMPSHIRE	1.40	2.00	3.00	1.33	2.63	3.63	2.50	4.38	6.25
NEW JERSEY	5.00	16.71	18.38	3.50	23.29	15.92	5.80	19.38	19.36
NEW MEXICO	2.00	4.00	3.43	1.75	3.00	2.60	3.17	4.50	5.29
NEW YORK	5.62	6.13	8.41	5.68	8.38	10.85	8.54	11.92	16.34
NORTH CAROLINA	1.79	1.50	2.42	2.06	6.70	6.82	3.55	7.42	8.89
NORTH DAKOTA	1.20	3.67	2.43	1.50	11.25	6.75	2.50	14.00	8.88
OHIO	3.47	3.48	4.26	2.04	7.45	7.15	4.80	9.42	10.60
OKLAHOMA	3.00	3.64	4.08	3.75	7.73	8.33	4.40	10.58	11.92
OREGON	1.40	4.60	4.29	1.40	5.63	5.78	2.33	7.56	8.20
PENNSYLVANIA	2.44	3.00	3.85	2.63	5.16	5.68	4.23	6.79	8.63
PUERTO RICO	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
RHODE ISLAND	1.00	6.50	5.40	2.00	5.17	4.71	1.50	9.50	8.57
SOUTH CAROLINA	1.78	2.33	2.47	2.11	3.80	3.80	3.89	5.36	6.27
SOUTH DAKOTA	1.33	2.50	2.56	1.80	7.00	6.50	2.83	8.88	8.80
TENNESSEE	1.33	2.27	2.56	1.33	5.25	5.26	2.33	6.50	7.63
TEXAS	1.73	4.45	4.68	2.67	8.00	8.00	3.63	12.20	12.44
UTAH	4.67	6.33	8.67	3.00	12.50	14.00	5.75	18.83	22.67
VERMONT	1.67	3.00	2.83	1.00	2.75	2.40	2.00	4.60	4.14
VIRGINIA	2.17	1.92	2.53	1.83	6.77	7.07	3.43	7.53	9.13
WASHINGTON	2.40	3.44	4.23	2.10	3.82	4.85	4.50	6.64	9.08
WEST VIRGINIA	2.00	2.00	2.46	7.50	4.80	7.71	8.67	5.64	10.00
WISCONSIN	2.30	3.83	4.43	2.20	8.10	8.77	3.75	11.38	13.00
UNITED STATES	2.86	3.88	4.49	3.16	6.65	7.10	5.13	8.70	10.49

supervisors is 3.16; the mean number of part-time secondary college supervisors is 6.65; and the mean total number of secondary college supervisors (both full-time and part-time) is 7.10. Table 19 also shows that the mean grand total (both elementary and secondary) of full-time college supervisors is 5.13; the mean grand total of part-time college supervisors is 8.70; and the mean grand total of both full-time and part-time elementary and secondary college supervisors is 10.49. Part-time college supervisors, in this item, might be either employed only part-time by the college or, if employed full-time by the college, devote only part of their time to the supervision of student teachers.

Though not shown in table 19, this study also revealed that the responding institutions had a total of 2,637 full-time college supervisors; 5,942 part-time college supervisors; making a grand total of 8,579 college supervisors. Keeping in mind that this study included approximately 76% of all teacher preparing institutions in the United States, if one could assume that the number of college supervisors in the nonresponding institutions is proportionate to the number of college supervisors in the responding institutions (which is probably not an unreasonable assumption), then the total number of college supervisors at all of the 1,110 teacher preparing institutions in the United States can be estimated to be: 3,470 full-time college supervisors; 7,818 part-time college supervisors; making an estimated grand total of approximately 11,288 college supervisors in the United States. While these figures are obviously not precise, they probably do represent excellent approximations.

Table 20 deals with the degree status of all college supervisors and with the type of college supervisors used in the secondary student teaching program. This table shows that, for the entire country, at 6% of the responding institutions, all of the college supervisors have a doctor's degree; at 31% of the institutions, most of the college supervisors have a doctor's degree, at 56% of the institutions, most of the college supervisors have a master's degree plus additional graduate work; at 6% of the institutions, most of the college supervisors have only a master's degree as their highest degree; and at 1% of the institutions, most of the college supervisors have only a bachelor's degree as their highest degree.

Table 20 also shows that 31% of the responding institutions utilize general college supervisors in their secondary student teaching program; 13% utilize college supervisors from the academic areas; 49% utilize both general college supervisors and supervisors from the academic areas; and 6% checked the "other" category on this item.

Table 21 deals with the use of graduate students to supervise student teachers. This table shows that a total of 76, or 9%, of the responding institutions utilize graduate students to supervise student teachers. Table 21 also shows the mean per cent of the total student

TABLE 20. COLLEGE SUPERVISORS: DEGREE STATUS AND TYPE USED IN SECONDARY STUDENT TEACHING PROGRAM.

	Degree Status					Type Used in. Secondary Student Teaching Program*			
	All Ph.D. or Ed.D.	Most Ph.D. or Ed.D.	Most Master's Plus	Most Master's	Most Bachelors	1	2	3	4
ALABAMA	18%	24%	59%	0%	0%	41%	0%	41%	18%
ALASKA	50	50	0	0	0	50	0	50	0
ARIZONA	0	0	100	0	0	0	0	100	0
ARKANSAS	0	30	70	0	0	40	20	40	0
CALIFORNIA	8	55	34	3	0	40	10	45	3
COLORADO	27	46	27	0	0	27	18	55	0
CONNECTICUT	0	36	55	9	0	27	46	18	9
DIST. OF COL.	17	33	50	0	0	33	33	33	0
FLORIDA	8	54	39	0	0	46	15	31	8
GEORGIA	6	53	24	18	0	65	12	12	6
IDAHO	33	33	33	0	0	67	0	33	0
ILLINOIS	3	25	60	13	0	30	13	48	8
INDIANA	4	46	39	12	0	35	12	54	0
IOWA	4	31	58	8	0	15	12	73	0
KANSAS	0	33	67	0	0	22	6	67	6
KENTUCKY	7	20	67	7	0	27	13	53	7
LOUISIANA	7	50	43	0	0	43	0	57	0
MAINE	0	10	80	10	0	30	20	50	0
MARYLAND	13	38	44	6	0	19	13	50	19
MASSACHUSETTS	3	15	64	15	3	21	15	39	18
MICHIGAN	5	20	65	10	0	45	0	45	10
MINNESOTA	0	25	60	10	5	25	0	65	0
MISSISSIPPI	0	36	46	9	0	36	9	46	0
MISSOURI	0	40	50	10	0	25	30	40	0
MONTANA	0	33	50	17	0	17	0	83	0
NEBRASKA	7	36	57	0	0	29	7	57	7
NEW HAMPSHIRE	0	25	63	13	0	38	0	50	0
NEW JERSEY	7	33	53	0	7	27	27	40	7
NEW MEXICO	13	38	38	13	0	25	13	38	13
NEW YORK	3	31	66	0	0	12	34	37	10
NORTH CAROLINA	11	25	61	4	0	25	11	54	11
NORTH DAKOTA	0	0	88	13	0	13	25	52	13
OHIO	5	21	67	7	0	33	2	57	7
OKLAHOMA	15	54	31	0	0	62	23	7	7
OREGON	0	36	64	0	0	36	9	45	0
PENNSYLVANIA	10	25	57	8	0	25	8	64	3
PUERTO RICO	0	0	100	0	0	0	50	50	0
RHODE ISLAND	29	29	43	0	0	29	29	43	0
SOUTH CAROLINA	19	12	69	0	0	31	6	63	0
SOUTH DAKOTA	0	20	80	0	0	50	0	50	0
TENNESSEE	5	47	37	11	0	42	11	42	5
TEXAS	7	48	41	5	0	38	10	50	2
UTAH	0	17	67	17	0	17	17	67	0
VERMONT	13	25	50	0	13	25	0	50	13
VIRGINIA	7	20	73	0	0	20	20	53	7
WASHINGTON	0	46	54	0	0	39	8	54	0
WEST VIRGINIA	0	21	79	0	0	36	0	57	7
WISCONSIN	4	17	75	0	4	8	21	54	17
UNITED STATES	6%	31%	56%	6%	1%	31%	13%	49%	6%

*1. General college supervisors
2. College supervisors from the academic areas
3. A combination of both 1 and 2
4. Other

TABLE 21. USE OF GRADUATE STUDENTS TO SUPERVISE STUDENT TEACHERS.

	Institutions		Mean Per Cent of Total Program Supervised by Graduate Students
	Number	Per Cent	
ALABAMA	1	6%	50%
ALASKA	0	0	0
ARIZONA	1	50	28
ARKANSAS	1	10	10
CALIFORNIA	4	11	47
COLORADO	3	27	30
CONNECTICUT	2	18	7
DIST. OF COL.	0	0	0
FLORIDA	2	15	6
GEORGIA	1	6	10
IDAHO	0	0	0
ILLINOIS	2	5	40
INDIANA	3	12	30
IOWA	1	4	70
KANSAS	1	6	60
KENTUCKY	0	0	0
LOUISIANA	0	0	0
MAINE	1	10	18
MARYLAND	1	6	10
MASSACHUSETTS	2	6	55
MICHIGAN	2	10	37
MINNESOTA	0	0	0
MISSISSIPPI	1	9	20
MISSOURI	2	10	65
MONTANA	2	33	7
NEBRASKA	1	7	21
NEW HAMPSHIRE	0	0	0
NEW JERSEY	0	0	0
NEW MEXICO	1	13	25
NEW YORK	9	15	44
NORTH CAROLINA	3	11	10
NORTH DAKOTA	1	13	30
OHIO	6	14	30
OKLAHOMA	2	15	9
OREGON	0	0	0
PENNSYLVANIA	4	7	26
PUERTO RICO	0	0	0
RHODE ISLAND	0	0	0
SOUTH CAROLINA	1	6	20
SOUTH DAKOTA	1	10	0
TENNESSEE	2	11	10
TEXAS	4	10	26
UTAH	3	50	30
VERMONT	1	13	0
VIRGINIA	1	7	50
WASHINGTON	1	8	20
WEST VIRGINIA	1	7	5
WISCONSIN	1	4	60
UNITED STATES	76	9%	31%

teaching program supervised by graduate students. This figure, for the 76 institutions that utilize graduate students in this manner, is 31%. The range reported by various institutions was from 1% to 90%. Twenty-four institutions reported that less than 10% of their total student teaching program is supervised by graduate students, while 12 institutions reported that more than 50% of their total program is supervised by graduate students. Nearly all of the 76 institutions using graduate students as college supervisors are universities (where, presumably, doctorial students are available for this task).

Table 22 shows data regarding the average number of student teachers assigned to each full-time college supervisor (or the equivalent of a full-time supervisor) at any one time. This table shows that at 4% of the responding institutions, from 1 to 5 student teachers constitute the full-time college supervisor load; at 17% of the institutions, the full-time college supervisor is assigned 6-10 student teachers; at 21% of the institutions, from 11-15 student teachers; at 28% of the institutions, from 16-20 student teachers; at 14% of the institutions, from 21-25 student teachers; at 8% of the institutions, from 26-30 student teachers; at 4% of the institutions, from 31-35 student teachers; at 1% of the institutions, from 36-40 student teachers; and at 1% of the institutions, the full-time college supervisor is assigned over 40 student teachers at a time.

The frequency of college supervisor visits to each student teacher is shown in table 23. This table shows that, for the entire country, the college supervisor visits each student teacher twice each week at 3% of the institutions; once each week at 24% of the institutions; once every two weeks at 45% of the institutions; once every three weeks at 15% of the institutions; once each month at 9% of the institutions; once every two months at 1% of the institutions; once each quarter at 1% of the institutions; and once each semester at 1% of the institutions. Two institutions reported that they "never" visit their student teachers; however, these constitute less than one half of one per cent and therefore do not show up on table 23.

Respondents were asked to describe the procedure used for equating the load of a faculty member supervising student teachers to the load of a faculty member engaged in classroom teaching. The vast majority of the respondents indicated that they have no hard and fast rule to following in doing this. Most institutions also mentioned that the load varied from one student teaching period to another, according to the number of student teachers that had to be covered. Even so, most institutions indicated that they did use rough guidelines in equating the load of a faculty member supervising student teachers to the load of faculty members engaged in classroom teaching. The most frequently mentioned guidelines, in order, were: 2 student teachers = 1 semester hour of teaching load;

TABLE 22. AVERAGE NUMBER OF STUDENT TEACHERS ASSIGNED TO EACH FULL-TIME COLLEGE SUPERVISOR AT ANY ONE TIME.

	1-5	6-10	11-15	16-20	21-25	26-30	31-35	36-40	40+
ALABAMA	0%	18%	18%	29%	6%	0%	24%	6%	0%
ALASKA	0	50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
ARIZONA	0	50	0	0	0	50	0	0	0
ARKANSAS	0	20	20	30	0	10	10	10	0
CALIFORNIA	3	24	32	21	18	0	3	0	0
COLORADO	18	0	0	18	36	18	9	0	0
CONNECTICUT	0	27	36	9	18	9	0	0	0
DIST. OF COL.	0	33	33	33	0	0	0	0	0
FLORIDA	0	23	15	15	39	0	8	0	0
GEORGIA	0	18	24	47	0	12	0	0	0
IDAHO	0	0	67	33	0	0	0	0	0
ILLINOIS	3	38	15	25	15	5	0	0	0
INDIANA	4	4	23	23	12	19	8	4	4
IOWA	4	31	12	27	15	8	4	0	0
KANSAS	0	17	11	39	17	11	0	0	0
KENTUCKY	7	0	20	33	27	13	0	0	0
LOUISIANA	7	14	14	29	7	14	7	0	0
MAINE	10	50	20	10	10	0	0	0	0
MARYLAND	0	31	19	31	13	0	0	0	0
MASSACHUSETTS	12	18	24	12	15	9	3	0	0
MICHIGAN	5	0	10	35	35	0	10	5	0
MINNESOTA	0	0	20	60	10	5	0	5	0
MISSISSIPPI	0	9	27	36	0	18	0	0	0
MISSOURI	0	15	15	30	15	10	5	10	0
MONTANA	0	0	33	67	0	0	0	0	0
NEBRASKA	0	0	14	36	14	29	7	0	0
NEW HAMPSHIRE	13	13	25	13	25	0	13	0	0
NEW JERSEY	7	20	27	0	13	7	0	0	0
NEW MEXICO	0	25	13	38	13	13	0	0	0
NEW YORK	9	25	31	25	5	0	2	0	0
NORTH CAROLINA	0	14	32	39	7	7	0	0	0
NORTH DAKOTA	0	13	25	38	25	0	0	0	0
OHIO	0	29	5	38	14	7	5	0	0
OKLAHOMA	8	0	15	23	8	8	15	0	23
OREGON	0	0	55	36	9	0	0	0	0
PENNSYLVANIA	3	21	23	21	16	10	3	0	0
PUERTO RICO	0	0	50	0	50	0	0	0	0
RHODE ISLAND	0	0	0	29	0	43	0	0	29
SOUTH CAROLINA	0	0	31	31	13	6	0	6	13
SOUTH DAKOTA	0	0	30	40	20	10	0	0	0
TENNESSEE	11	11	5	53	11	5	0	0	5
TEXAS	2	12	26	17	12	17	7	0	2
UTAH	0	50	0	33	17	0	0	0	0
VERMONT	0	38	0	38	0	13	0	0	0
VIRGINIA	20	20	13	20	20	7	0	0	0
WASHINGTON	0	23	23	46	8	0	0	0	0
WEST VIRGINIA	0	0	36	29	36	0	0	0	0
WISCONSIN	4	13	25	21	17	8	4	0	4
UNITED STATES	4%	17%	21%	28%	14%	8%	4%	1%	1%

TABLE 23. FREQUENCY OF COLLEGE SUPERVISOR VISITS TO EACH STUDENT TEACHER.

	2/wk.	1/wk.	1/2wks.	1/3wks.	1/mo.	1/2mo.	1/qt.	1/sem.	Never
ALABAMA	6%	41%	29%	18%	6%	0%	0%	0%	0%
ALASKA	0	50	50	0	0	0	0	0	0
ARIZONA	0	0	0	0	50	50	0	0	0
ARKANSAS	0	20	70	0	10	0	0	0	0
CALIFORNIA	3	61	29	5	0	0	0	0	0
COLORADO	0	27	27	27	18	0	0	0	0
CONNECTICUT	0	27	64	0	0	0	9	0	0
DIST. OF COL.	0	50	50	0	0	0	0	0	0
FLORIDA	0	31	39	31	0	0	0	0	0
GEORGIA	0	35	65	0	0	0	0	0	0
IDAHO	0	67	33	0	0	0	0	0	0
ILLINOIS	10	23	38	20	8	0	3	0	0
INDIANA	0	0	62	27	12	0	0	0	0
IOWA	0	35	46	15	4	0	0	0	0
KANSAS	0	11	44	33	11	0	0	0	0
KENTUCKY	0	0	27	33	33	7	0	0	0
LOUISIANA	0	21	43	29	7	0	0	0	0
MAINE	10	50	20	0	10	0	10	0	0
MARYLAND	6	6	56	19	13	0	0	0	0
MASSACHUSETTS	0	12	39	27	15	3	0	3	0
MICHIGAN	0	0	30	35	25	5	5	0	0
MINNESOTA	0	10	70	15	0	0	0	0	0
MISSISSIPPI	0	9	46	27	0	9	0	0	9
MISSOURI	0	10	35	15	20	10	5	0	0
MONTANA	0	6	33	0	0	0	0	0	0
NEBRASKA	0	0	50	14	29	7	0	0	0
NEW HAMPSHIRE	0	0	63	13	13	0	13	0	0
NEW JERSEY	0	0	87	7	0	7	0	0	0
NEW MEXICO	0	13	75	13	0	0	0	0	0
NEW YORK	3	14	44	15	20	[illegible]	2	[illegible]	[illegible]
NORTH CAROLINA	7	43	29	4	4	0	0	0	0
NORTH DAKOTA	0	13	75	13	0	0	0	0	0
OHIO	2	24	55	10	10	0	0	0	0
OKLAHOMA	0	8	39	31	23	0	0	0	0
OREGON	0	46	36	0	9	0	0	0	0
PENNSYLVANIA	2	44	38	13	3	0	0	0	0
PUERTO RICO	0	0	50	50	0	0	0	0	0
RHODE ISLAND	0	0	29	0	29	29	14	0	0
SOUTH CAROLINA	19	19	44	6	0	0	0	13	0
SOUTH DAKOTA	10	30	60	0	0	0	0	0	0
TENNESSEE	11	47	21	5	5	0	5	0	0
TEXAS	2	28	45	7	14	0	0	0	0
UTAH	0	33	67	0	0	0	0	0	0
VERMONT	13	38	25	25	0	0	0	0	0
VIRGINIA	0	20	73	7	0	0	0	0	0
WASHINGTON	0	54	31	15	0	0	0	0	0
WEST VIRGINIA	7	29	36	29	0	0	0	0	0
WISCONSIN	0	4	63	17	13	0	0	0	0
UNITED STATES	3%	24%	45%	15%	9%	1%	1%	1%	0%

3 student teachers = 1 semester hour of teaching load; 10 student teachers = 3 semester hours; 12 hour class load = 18 student teachers; 8 student teachers = 3 semester hours; and 2½ student teachers = 1 semester hour. Though not mentioned often, some of the more interesting guidelines mentioned include: college supervisor expected to put in a 45 hour work week; five-eighths instructor points per student teacher--15 instructor points is a full load; 4 student teachers = 1 college course; 1⅓ student teachers = 1 semester hour; try to base load on number of student teachers plus distance from campus; supervision regardless of number of student teachers is considered one course; and .75 quarter hours per student teacher. One institution reported the use of the following formula in determining the load of their college supervisors:

$$\frac{N\ (2V)}{16\ (In) + N\ (2V)} = \%\ \text{of load time spent on supervision}$$

where: In = institution load
N = no. of student teachers
V = no. of supervisory visits (2 because each unit consists of an observation plus a conference)

The respondents were asked what they felt would be the most desirable, yet practical, ratio of full-time college supervisors to student teachers. Table 24 shows the results of this question. As the table shows, for the entire country, 12% of the respondents recommended one college supervisor to less than 10 student teachers; 14% recommended one college supervisor to 10-11 student teachers; 8% recommended one to 12-13; 22% recommended one to 14-15; 9% recommended one to 16-17; 13% recommended one to 18-19; 17% recommended one to 20-25; 3% recommended one to 26-30; and 0% recommended one college supervisor to more than 30 student teachers (actually 2 institutions made this last recommendation but they constituted less than one half of one per cent). One should keep in mind that it was the person in charge of the student teaching program that made these recommendations.

The respondents were also asked to indicate the most important characteristics they look for in a college supervisor. Table 25 shows the results of that question. For the entire United States, 45% of all respondents indicated that the most important characteristic they look for in a college supervisor is good human relations skills; 29% listed knowledge of teaching methodology as the single most important characteristic for a college supervisor; 20% listed a commitment to supervision; 11% listed subject matter competency; 1% listed possession of a doctor's degree as the most important characteristic for a college supervisor; and 4% checked the "other" category on this item. There were a total of 28 "other" characteristics listed by these 4%. Of these, the most frequently listed were: willingness to travel; willingness to experiment; general cultural quality--intelligence, academic background, language facility; and teaching experience.

TABLE 24. RECOMMENDED RATIO OF FULL-TIME COLLEGE SUPERVISORS TO STUDENT TEACHERS.

	1 to 1-9	1 to 10-11	1 to 12-13	1 to 14-15	1 to 16-17	1 to 18-19	1 to 20-25	1 to 26-30	1 to 30+
ALABAMA	6%	0%	12%	24%	12%	24%	12%	12%	0%
ALASKA	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
ARIZONA	0	0	0	0	0	50	0	50	0
ARKANSAS	0	10	0	20	20	10	40	0	0
CALIFORNIA	16	13	16	16	13	16	11	0	0
COLORADO	0	0	9	27	0	9	55	0	0
CONNECTICUT	27	18	9	9	18	0	9	9	0
DIST. OF COL.	50	17	0	17	17	0	0	0	0
FLORIDA	0	23	8	8	0	23	31	0	0
GEORGIA	18	12	0	41	12	6	12	0	0
IDAHO	0	33	0	33	0	33	0	0	0
ILLINOIS	15	18	5	15	10	18	15	0	0
INDIANA	15	0	12	8	8	12	35	12	0
IOWA	19	19	4	15	0	15	23	4	0
KANSAS	11	6	6	22	6	17	28	0	0
KENTUCKY	7	7	7	33	7	20	20	0	0
LOUISIANA	21	7	0	7	7	21	29	7	0
MAINE	10	40	20	10	10	0	0	0	0
MARYLAND	6	0	19	25	25	6	6	0	0
MASSACHUSETTS	39	12	6	15	3	9	3	0	0
MICHIGAN	5	5	5	10	5	25	45	0	0
MINNESOTA	0	15	15	45	10	5	5	0	0
MISSISSIPPI	9	9	0	27	9	27	18	0	0
MISSOURI	15	20	10	25	5	0	10	5	0
MONTANA	33	17	17	0	0	33	0	0	0
NEBRASKA	0	7	7	21	14	29	14	0	0
NEW HAMPSHIRE	13	25	13	38	0	0	13	0	0
NEW JERSEY	27	20	0	20	7	7	7	0	7
NEW MEXICO	25	13	0	38	0	13	13	0	0
NEW YORK	14	25	12	31	3	5	7	0	0
NORTH CAROLINA	11	4	11	25	0	21	14	4	0
NORTH DAKOTA	0	0	0	38	38	13	13	0	0
OHIO	7	7	7	19	2	26	29	0	0
OKLAHOMA	31	0	0	8	0	15	15	23	0
OREGON	0	46	18	9	18	9	0	0	0
PENNSYLVANIA	13	13	7	23	10	7	23	0	0
PUERTO RICO	50	0	0	0	0	0	50	0	0
RHODE ISLAND	14	14	14	14	0	14	14	14	0
SOUTH CAROLINA	6	25	13	19	13	13	13	0	0
SOUTH DAKOTA	0	0	20	20	40	0	20	0	0
TENNESSEE	11	5	0	32	11	16	16	11	0
TEXAS	5	7	5	14	7	14	29	7	2
UTAH	12	0	0	33	17	0	33	0	0
VERMONT	0	38	0	25	25	0	0	0	0
VIRGINIA	0	20	7	33	7	20	13	0	0
WASHINGTON	8	31	15	8	15	15	8	0	0
WEST VIRGINIA	0	21	7	50	7	7	7	0	0
WISCONSIN	13	17	4	29	4	17	13	0	0
UNITED STATES	12%	14%	8%	22%	9%	13%	17%	3%	0%

TABLE 25. CHARACTERISTICS SOUGHT IN COLLEGE SUPERVISORS.

	Characteristics Sought*					
	1	2	3	4	5	6
ALABAMA	59%	29%	12%	6%	6%	0%
ALASKA	100	0	0	0	0	0
ARIZONA	0	0	100	0	0	0
ARKANSAS	40	20	30	10	0	0
CALIFORNIA	58	24	11	13	0	5
COLORADO	36	55	18	9	0	0
CONNECTICUT	55	27	0	18	0	0
DIST. OF COL.	67	33	33	0	0	0
FLORIDA	39	31	23	0	0	8
GEORGIA	77	29	18	18	6	0
IDAHO	33	33	33	0	0	0
ILLINOIS	33	33	33	13	0	0
INDIANA	42	27	31	12	0	0
IOWA	27	46	8	15	0	38
KANSAS	33	22	22	11	0	6
KENTUCKY	47	27	27	0	0	0
LOUISIANA	57	14	14	0	7	7
MAINE	30	40	20	0	10	0
MARYLAND	38	25	25	13	0	0
MASSACHUSETTS	33	18	32	15	3	6
MICHIGAN	25	40	25	0	0	5
MINNESOTA	50	30	15	10	0	0
MISSISSIPPI	55	18	18	27	0	9
MISSOURI	50	25	15	10	0	0
MONTANA	67	33	0	0	0	0
NEBRASKA	50	43	14	14	0	0
NEW HAMPSHIRE	50	38	25	13	0	0
NEW JERSEY	67	13	33	7	0	0
NEW MEXICO	38	50	13	25	0	15
NEW YORK	36	31	22	19	0	5
NORTH CAROLINA	39	29	14	14	4	7
NORTH DAKOTA	50	0	25	13	0	13
OHIO	57	21	10	12	0	5
OKLAHOMA	15	39	23	8	8	8
OREGON	55	9	18	0	0	9
PENNSYLVANIA	39	28	28	10	0	5
PUERTO RICO	50	0	0	50	0	0
RHODE ISLAND	71	14	0	0	0	14
SOUTH CAROLINA	44	19	25	25	0	0
SOUTH DAKOTA	50	40	20	0	0	0
TENNESSEE	37	32	11	16	0	11
TEXAS	45	26	24	7	0	2
UTAH	33	50	17	0	0	0
VERMONT	50	25	13	13	0	0
VIRGINIA	47	47	13	27	0	0
WASHINGTON	62	15	23	0	0	0
WEST VIRGINIA	43	50	7	7	0	7
WISCONSIN	50	42	13	8	4	4
UNITED STATES	45%	29%	20%	11%	1%	4%

*1. Human Relations Skills
2. Knowledge of Teaching Methodology
3. A Commitment to Supervisions
4. Subject Matter Competency
5. Possession of Doctor's Degree
6. Other

Table 26 deals with the percentage of institutions at which college supervisors hold joint appointments in two departments. For instance, this table shows that at 37% of the responding institutions, at least some of the college supervisors hold joint appointments in two departments. Of course, like all the other tables in this report, table 26 also shows this same information for each state and territory from which completed questionnaires were received.

TABLE 26. COLLEGE SUPERVISORS HOLD JOINT APPOINTMENTS IN TWO DEPARTMENTS.

	Yes		Yes
ALABAMA	47%	MONTANA	50%
ALASKA	0	NEBRASKA	36
ARIZONA	0	NEW HAMPSHIRE	63
ARKANSAS	30	NEW JERSEY	27
CALIFORNIA	42	NEW MEXICO	13
COLORADO	9	NEW YORK	42
CONNECTICUT	55	NORTH CAROLINA	36
DIST. OF COL.	17	NORTH DAKOTA	50
FLORIDA	46	OHIO	43
GEORGIA	41	OKLAHOMA	31
IDAHO	33	OREGON	55
ILLINOIS	32	PENNSYLVANIA	26
INDIANA	46	PUERTO RICO	50
IOWA	50	RHODE ISLAND	57
KANSAS	44	SOUTH CAROLINA	25
KENTUCKY	20	SOUTH DAKOTA	30
LOUISIANA	36	TENNESSEE	32
MAINE	50	TEXAS	33
MARYLAND	38	UTAH	33
MASSACHUSETTS	36	VERMONT	13
MICHIGAN	35	VIRGINIA	20
MINNESOTA	25	WASHINGTON	46
MISSISSIPPI	36	WEST VIRGINIA	43
MISSOURI	50	WISCONSIN	54
		UNITED STATES	37%

Institutions were asked to explain the joint appointment arrangement if they had college supervisors who held such appointments. The vast majority of these institutions reported that the joint appointments were between the student teaching department (or education department, or secondary education department) and one of the academic departments (history English, art, music, etc.). Though mentioned less frequently, some of the other college supervisor joint appointments listed were between: the student teaching department and a public school (variations of the clinical professorship); education department and psychology department; and student teaching department and secondary education department or elementary education department. A few institutions also reported that some college supervisors devoted part of their time to other administrative positions such as director of placement, director of upward bound program, etc.

The Student Teachers Themselves. Items 37 through 51 dealt with the student teachers themselves. This section of the report shows the results of these questions.

Table 27 shows the enrollment of student teachers during the 1966-67 academic year. As this table shows, for the entire country, 9% of the respondents reported a student teacher enrollment of under 25 for the 1966-67 academic school year; 19% reported a student teacher enrollment of 25-49; 26% reported between 50-99 student teachers; 26% reported between 100-299 student teachers; 9% reported between 300-499 student teachers; 5% reported between 500-699 student teachers; 4% reported between 700-999 student teachers; 2% reported between 1,000-2,000 student teachers; and 3 institutions actually reported an enrollment of more than 2,000 student teachers, however, they constitute less than one-half of one per cent and this value is therefore rounded off to 0% on table 27.

Table 28 shows the student teacher enrollment during the 1967 summer session. For the entire country, 67% of the respondents indicated they did not have any student teachers during the 1967 summer session. Thirteen per cent of all respondents reported between 1-10 student teachers during the 1967 summer session; 9% reported between 11-25 summer student teachers; 4% reported between 26-50 summer student teachers; 4% reported between 51-100 summer student teachers; and 1% reported between 101-150 summer student teachers. A total of 5 institutions actually reported summer student teacher enrollments of more than 150; 3 of these reported between 151-200 summer student teachers, 1 reported between 201-300 summer student teachers, and 1 reported over 300 summer student teachers.

Table 29 deals with the type of grade used for student teaching. This table shows that 82% of all responding institutions use a letter grade (A, B, C, etc.) for student teaching; 8% use Pass or Fail; 6% use Satisfactory or Unsatisfactory; and 4% checked the "other" category on this item. Some of the "other" grading systems mentioned included: credit or non-credit; honors, high pass, pass, or fail; honors, satisfactory, or unsatisfactory; A or B for passing, C for failure; letter grade or pass, fail, on an option bases; letter grade for part-time student teaching, satisfactory or unsatisfactory for full-time student teaching.

TABLE 27. STUDENT TEACHER ENROLLMENT DURING THE 1966-67 ACADEMIC SCHOOL YEAR.

	Under 25	25-49	50-99	100-299	300-499	500-699	700-999	1000-2000	Over 2000
ALABAMA	0%	18%	18%	47%	0%	6%	0%	0%	6%
ALASKA	50	50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
ARIZONA	0	0	50	0	0	0	0	50	0
ARKANSAS	0	20	20	40	20	0	0	0	0
CALIFORNIA	11	34	21	13	11	5	5	0	0
COLORADO	0	9	27	27	27	0	0	9	0
CONNECTICUT	0	27	18	27	9	0	18	0	0
DIST. OF COL.	17	50	17	17	0	0	0	0	0
FLORIDA	8	8	15	31	15	15	8	0	0
GEORGIA	12	12	29	41	6	0	0	0	0
IDAHO	0	0	33	67	0	0	0	0	0
ILLINOIS	15	23	25	10	3	8	3	5	0
INDIANA	8	19	27	31	0	0	12	4	0
IOWA	4	8	54	23	4	4	4	0	0
KANSAS	6	39	22	11	11	11	0	0	0
KENTUCKY	0	20	40	13	7	20	0	0	0
LOUISIANA	7	0	36	36	21	0	0	0	0
MAINE	30	30	10	20	10	0	0	0	0
MARYLAND	13	50	13	13	6	0	6	0	0
MASSACHUSETTS	12	15	30	27	3	6	3	3	0
MICHIGAN	0	10	40	25	10	0	5	0	10
MINNESOTA	0	10	25	45	10	5	5	0	0
MISSISSIPPI	0	9	18	36	18	9	0	0	0
MISSOURI	10	20	20	25	20	5	0	0	0
MONTANA	0	33	17	50	0	0	0	0	0
NEBRASKA	36	64	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
NEW HAMPSHIRE	25	25	13	38	0	0	0	0	0
NEW JERSEY	20	33	7	7	0	13	20	0	0
NEW MEXICO	0	25	38	38	0	0	0	0	0
NEW YORK	15	22	20	12	14	9	5	3	0
NORTH CAROLINA	0	18	39	39	0	4	0	0	0
NORTH DAKOTA	0	25	13	38	25	0	0	0	0
OHIO	5	14	24	38	7	2	2	7	0
OKLAHOMA	0	0	23	46	8	23	0	0	0
OREGON	18	0	46	18	18	0	0	0	0
PENNSYLVANIA	16	16	31	15	7	7	5	2	0
PUERTO RICO	0	0	50	0	50	0	0	0	0
RHODE ISLAND	0	14	43	29	14	0	0	0	0
SOUTH CAROLINA	13	6	44	31	6	0	0	0	0
SOUTH DAKOTA	0	10	30	50	10	0	0	0	0
TENNESSEE	11	11	26	32	11	11	0	0	0
TEXAS	7	21	17	26	12	7	5	0	0
UTAH	17	0	17	17	0	17	17	17	0
VERMONT	25	38	13	25	0	0	0	0	0
VIRGINIA	13	27	20	20	20	0	0	0	0
WASHINGTON	15	8	8	31	15	8	15	0	0
WEST VIRGINIA	7	7	29	43	14	0	0	0	0
WISCONSIN	8	13	33	25	21	0	0	0	0
UNITED STATES	9%	19%	26%	26%	9%	5%	4%	2%	0%

TABLE 28. STUDENT TEACHER ENROLLMENT DURING 1967 SUMMER SESSION.

	0	1-10	11-25	26-50	51-100	101-150
ALABAMA	35%	24%	18%	18%	0%	0%
ALASKA	100	0	0	0	0	0
ARIZONA	0	0	50	0	50	0
ARKANSAS	90	0	0	10	0	0
CALIFORNIA	50	16	16	5	13	0
COLORADO	82	0	18	0	0	0
CONNECTICUT	73	0	0	9	18	0
DIST. OF COL.	83	0	17	0	0	0
FLORIDA	77	23	0	0	0	0
GEORGIA	77	0	6	6	0	6
IDAHO	33	33	33	0	0	0
ILLINOIS	48	20	15	8	5	3
INDIANA	58	23	19	0	0	0
IOWA	62	23	8	0	8	0
KANSAS	56	28	6	6	6	0
KENTUCKY	33	33	13	13	7	0
LOUISIANA	93	0	0	0	0	7
MAINE	90	0	0	0	0	0
MARYLAND	69	13	0	6	0	0
MASSACHUSETTS	76	3	3	12	3	0
MICHIGAN	0	10	40	25	10	0
MINNESOTA	55	15	5	5	0	10
MISSISSIPPI	73	0	9	0	0	0
MISSOURI	50	5	25	15	5	0
MONTANA	33	50	0	17	0	0
NEBRASKA	64	14	14	0	7	0
NEW HAMPSHIRE	100	0	0	0	0	0
NEW JERSEY	100	0	0	0	0	0
NEW MEXICO	13	75	13	0	0	0
NEW YORK	88	5	2	2	0	2
NORTH CAROLINA	82	11	4	0	4	0
NORTH DAKOTA	13	38	38	13	0	0
OHIO	69	17	5	2	5	0
OKLAHOMA	69	23	8	0	0	0
OREGON	73	9	18	0	0	0
PENNSYLVANIA	77	10	3	3	5	2
PUERTO RICO	100	0	0	0	0	0
RHODE ISLAND	100	0	0	0	0	0
SOUTH CAROLINA	69	6	13	0	0	13
SOUTH DAKOTA	40	10	10	20	10	0
TENNESSEE	42	11	32	11	0	0
TEXAS	91	2	2	0	0	2
UTAH	50	50	0	0	0	0
VERMONT	88	0	0	0	13	0
VIRGINIA	73	7	13	7	0	0
WASHINGTON	62	23	8	0	0	0
WEST VIRGINIA	43	14	21	7	14	0
WISCONSIN	46	25	13	4	8	4
UNITED STATES	67%	13%	9%	4%	4%	1%

TABLE 29. TYPE OF GRADE USED FOR STUDENT TEACHING.

	Letter Grade	Pass or Fail	Satisfactory or Unsatisfactory	Other
ALABAMA	88%	6%	6%	0%
ALASKA	100	0	0	0
ARIZONA	0	50	0	50
ARKANSAS	90	10	0	0
CALIFORNIA	55	29	5	8
COLORADO	100	0	0	0
CONNECTICUT	82	0	0	18
DIST. OF COL.	100	0	0	0
FLORIDA	62	8	23	8
GEORGIA	77	18	6	0
IDAHO	100	0	0	0
ILLINOIS	80	8	8	3
INDIANA	77	4	19	0
IOWA	89	8	0	4
KANSAS	94	6	0	0
KENTUCKY	33	13	33	13
LOUISIANA	93	0	7	0
MAINE	70	0	10	20
MARYLAND	81	6	0	6
MASSACHUSETTS	91	3	3	3
MICHIGAN	85	10	5	0
MINNESOTA	60	20	15	5
MISSISSIPPI	91	0	0	0
MISSOURI	90	10	0	0
MONTANA	100	0	0	0
NEBRASKA	93	0	0	7
NEW HAMPSHIRE	88	0	0	13
NEW JERSEY	87	13	0	0
NEW MEXICO	88	0	13	0
NEW YORK	70	7	17	7
NORTH CAROLINA	93	0	7	0
NORTH DAKOTA	75	0	25	0
OHIO	74	10	12	5
OKLAHOMA	62	15	23	0
OREGON	46	46	0	9
PENNSYLVANIA	90	7	0	3
PUERTO RICO	100	0	0	0
RHODE ISLAND	100	0	0	0
SOUTH CAROLINA	88	12	0	0
SOUTH DAKOTA	100	0	0	0
TENNESSEE	90	11	0	0
TEXAS	88	5	2	2
UTAH	50	33	0	17
VERMONT	75	0	13	13
VIRGINIA	93	7	0	0
WASHINGTON	62	23	15	0
WEST VIRGINIA	93	0	0	0
WISCONSIN	88	4	4	4
UNITED STATES	82%	6%	8%	4%

Respondents were asked to rank, according to importance, those who participate in the evaluation of student teachers. Table 30 shows the results of that question. This table indicates that 53% of the respondents ranked the cooperating teacher as the very most important person in the evaluation of the student teacher; 48% said the college supervisor was the very most important; 15% said the director of student teaching was the most important; and 2% said the principal of the cooperating school was the very most important person in the evaluation of student teachers. Table 30 further shows that 42% of the respondents indicated that the cooperating teacher was the second most important person in the evaluation of student teachers; 43% ranked the college supervisor as the second most important; 12% ranked the director of student teaching as the second most important; and 6% ranked the principal of the cooperating school as the second most important person in the evaluation of student teachers. Approximately 3% of the respondents indicated that the student teacher also has a voice in his or her own evaluation.

Table 31 deals with three aspects of student teaching. First, this table shows the per cent of institutions at which student teachers have classroom observation experiences prior to the student teaching assignment. For instance, for the entire country, 91% of the respondents indicated that their student teachers did have some observation experiences prior to student teaching. Table 31 further shows that 72% of the responding institutions allow the student teacher to have some choice in his or her assignment. Most institutions further explained that their student teachers could "request" a certain assignment but did not have absolute assurance of getting the exact assignment requested. Respondents were also asked to indicate whether or not they provided teaching in disadvantaged areas. Table 31 also shows the results of this question. It can be noted that 75% of all respondents indicated that they did provide this opportunity.

Table 32 shows the results of a question dealing with the practice of placing more than one student teacher in a given classroom at the same time. This table shows that 62% of all respondents reported that they "never" place more than one student teacher in a classroom at the same time; 29% reported that they "rarely" do this; 4% reported that they do this "quite often"; and 2 institutions reported that they "always" place more than one student teacher in a given classroom at the same time (however, they constitute less than one-half of one per cent and therefore are reported as 0% on table 32).

Table 33 shows the average per cent of time that student teachers spend in observation, participation, and actual teaching. As this table shows, for the entire country, the average student teacher devotes 20% of the time to observation, 24% of the time to participation, and 56% of the time to actual teaching.

TABLE 30. RANK IMPORTANCE OF STUDENT TEACHER EVALUATORS.

	Cooperating Teacher		College Supervisor		Director of Student Teaching		Cooperating Principal	
	Rank 1	Rank 2	Rank 1	Rank 2	Rank 1	Rank 2	Rank 1	Rank 2
ALABAMA	53%	47%	41%	59%	0%	0%	0%	6%
ALASKA	0	100	100	0	0	0	0	0
ARIZONA	100	0	0	50	0	0	0	50
ARKANSAS	60	40	40	60	0	0	0	0
CALIFORNIA	45	47	55	34	13	13	3	11
COLORADO	64	36	46	55	0	9	0	0
CONNECTICUT	73	27	55	36	18	9	9	0
DIST. OF COL.	83	17	17	50	17	17	0	0
FLORIDA	39	62	62	31	0	15	0	0
GEORGIA	53	47	53	41	6	12	0	6
IDAHO	67	33	33	67	0	0	0	0
ILLINOIS	45	50	55	38	5	3	0	0
INDIANA	69	23	39	54	16	8	4	4
IOWA	54	35	46	39	19	4	0	4
KANSAS	67	33	44	44	6	6	0	6
KENTUCKY	93	7	0	73	7	7	0	13
LOUISIANA	71	21	36	57	14	14	0	7
MAINE	40	40	30	60	40	0	0	0
MARYLAND	38	44	50	44	13	6	6	0
MASSACHUSETTS	36	49	64	33	9	6	3	3
MICHIGAN	60	35	35	55	10	5	35	55
MINNESOTA	55	35	35	65	5	10	0	0
MISSISSIPPI	27	55	73	18	9	0	0	9
MISSOURI	50	40	40	50	10	5	5	0
MONTANA	50	50	67	33	0	0	0	0
NEBRASKA	57	43	50	43	0	14	0	0
NEW HAMPSHIRE	88	13	13	75	0	13	0	0
NEW JERSEY	53	47	67	20	7	0	0	13
NEW MEXICO	63	38	38	50	0	25	0	0
NEW YORK	49	42	53	54	7	9	2	2
NORTH CAROLINA	54	46	54	43	11	0	4	0
NORTH DAKOTA	75	13	38	50	0	13	0	0
OHIO	54	43	57	41	5	2	0	0
OKLAHOMA	46	54	54	39	0	0	0	8
OREGON	27	55	55	36	0	18	0	0
PENNSYLVANIA	39	56	59	34	8	7	0	0
PUERTO RICO	50	50	100	0	0	0	0	50
RHODE ISLAND	43	43	43	43	29	14	0	0
SOUTH CAROLINA	44	56	69	25	13	0	0	6
SOUTH DAKOTA	30	70	70	30	0	0	0	10
TENNESSEE	74	21	32	47	11	16	0	5
TEXAS	38	55	57	31	2	7	0	0
UTAH	33	67	67	33	0	0	0	0
VERMONT	63	38	38	50	25	0	0	0
VIRGINIA	53	47	47	47	7	0	0	0
WASHINGTON	62	31	31	69	0	0	0	0
WEST VIRGINIA	63	36	43	43	0	0	0	14
WISCONSIN	67	21	25	54	21	13	0	4
UNITED STATES	53%	42%	48%	43%	15%	12%	2%	6%

TABLE 31. STUDENT TEACHERS: OBSERVATION PRIOR TO STUDENT TEACHING; CHOICE OF ASSIGNMENT; AND OPPORTUNITY TO TEACH DISADVANTAGED.

	Have Observation Prior to Student Teaching	Student Teachers Have Some Choice In Assignments	Have Opportunity to Student Teach Disadvantaged
ALABAMA	94%	47%	65%
ALASKA	100	50	50
ARIZONA	100	100	100
ARKANSAS	90	90	80
CALIFORNIA	97	71	92
COLORADO	91	91	91
CONNECTICUT	91	73	100
DIST. OF COL.	100	50	100
FLORIDA	100	54	92
GEORGIA	100	59	77
IDAHO	100	100	67
ILLINOIS	93	75	78
INDIANA	89	92	73
IOWA	92	81	58
KANSAS	94	78	78
KENTUCKY	100	60	92
LOUISIANA	100	64	64
MAINE	100	50	50
MARYLAND	88	63	81
MASSACHUSETTS	88	82	76
MICHIGAN	90	80	35
MINNESOTA	90	70	70
MISSISSIPPI	55	73	73
MISSOURI	70	85	95
MONTANA	100	67	33
NEBRASKA	93	86	50
NEW HAMPSHIRE	88	88	63
NEW JERSEY	93	93	73
NEW MEXICO	88	63	88
NEW YORK	86	70	80
NORTH CAROLINA	96	50	79
NORTH DAKOTA	88	100	50
OHIO	95	60	76
OKLAHOMA	77	100	77
OREGON	100	73	55
PENNSYLVANIA	95	66	62
PUERTO RICO	100	50	100
RHODE ISLAND	57	71	86
SOUTH CAROLINA	94	56	88
SOUTH DAKOTA	90	80	20
TENNESSEE	79	63	84
TEXAS	95	74	83
UTAH	83	67	67
VERMONT	88	75	38
VIRGINIA	87	93	80
WASHINGTON	100	92	77
WEST VIRGINIA	92	79	64
WISCONSIN	92	79	75
UNITED STATES	91%	72%	75%

TABLE 32. PLACEMENT OF MORE THAN ONE STUDENT TEACHER IN A GIVEN CLASSROOM AT THE SAME TIME.

	Never	Rarely	Quite Often	Always
ALABAMA	29%	59%	12%	0%
ALASKA	50	50	0	0
ARIZONA	50	50	0	0
ARKANSAS	50	50	0	0
CALIFORNIA	82	18	0	0
COLORADO	82	9	0	0
CONNECTICUT	55	36	9	0
DIST. OF COL.	50	50	0	0
FLORIDA	62	31	8	0
GEORGIA	65	35	0	0
IDAHO	67	33	0	0
ILLINOIS	65	35	0	0
INDIANA	81	19	0	0
IOWA	77	23	0	0
KANSAS	78	22	0	0
KENTUCKY	33	53	13	0
LOUISIANA	29	29	36	7
MAINE	80	0	20	0
MARYLAND	69	19	13	0
MASSACHUSETTS	61	36	3	0
MICHIGAN	10	40	25	5
MINNESOTA	85	15	0	0
MISSISSIPPI	36	55	0	0
MISSOURI	75	25	0	0
MONTANA	33	67	0	0
NEBRASKA	50	50	0	0
NEW HAMPSHIRE	50	25	25	0
NEW JERSEY	93	7	0	0
NEW MEXICO	100	0	0	0
NEW YORK	68	29	3	0
NORTH CAROLINA	75	18	4	0
NORTH DAKOTA	75	25	0	0
OHIO	71	24	5	0
OKLAHOMA	46	54	0	0
OREGON	82	9	9	0
PENNSYLVANIA	74	25	2	0
PUERTO RICO	0	0	100	0
RHODE ISLAND	43	57	0	0
SOUTH CAROLINA	69	31	0	0
SOUTH DAKOTA	60	40	0	0
TENNESSEE	63	37	0	0
TEXAS	81	17	0	0
UTAH	33	50	17	0
VERMONT	100	0	0	0
VIRGINIA	67	33	0	0
WASHINGTON	92	8	0	0
WEST VIRGINIA	36	57	7	0
WISCONSIN	58	42	0	0
UNITED STATES	67%	29%	4%	0%

TABLE 33. MEAN PER CENT OF STUDENT TEACHERS' TIME SPENT IN OBSERVATION, PARTICIPATION, AND ACTUAL TEACHING.

	Mean Per Cent of Time Spent in:		
	Observation	Participation	Actual Teaching
ALABAMA	20%	25%	53%
ALASKA	25	25	50
ARIZONA	20	25	55
ARKANSAS	21	31	49
CALIFORNIA	15	20	66
COLORADO	14	20	68
CONNECTICUT	19	31	59
DIST. OF COL.	17	20	63
FLORIDA	14	22	64
GEORGIA	22	32	46
IDAHO	23	26	51
ILLINOIS	20	31	50
INDIANA	23	25	55
IOWA	23	23	55
KANSAS	20	29	53
KENTUCKY	21	24	56
LOUISIANA	22	25	53
MAINE	22	22	59
MARYLAND	20	23	59
MASSACHUSETTS	19	24	60
MICHIGAN	19	26	58
MINNESOTA	20	20	59
MISSISSIPPI	23	26	54
MISSOURI	23	25	54
MONTANA	17	19	68
NEBRASKA	21	28	55
NEW HAMPSHIRE	17	34	48
NEW JERSEY	21	20	63
NEW MEXICO	15	22	63
NEW YORK	21	26	55
NORTH CAROLINA	23	22	55
NORTH DAKOTA	19	19	62
OHIO	15	20	67
OKLAHOMA	19	30	51
OREGON	21	22	57
PENNSYLVANIA	24	22	57
PUERTO RICO	0	0	0
RHODE ISLAND	19	24	61
SOUTH CAROLINA	20	22	60
SOUTH DAKOTA	16	22	62
TENNESSEE	22	25	54
TEXAS	22	32	15
UTAH	13	20	67
VERMONT	13	13	77
VIRGINIA	21	22	57
WASHINGTON	21	29	50
WEST VIRGINIA	17	19	66
WISCONSIN	19	23	59
UNITED STATES	20%	24%	56%

Respondents were asked what per cent of their student teachers fail their first student teaching assignment and also what alternatives are available to such students. Table 34 shows the results of these questions. For instance, this table shows that, for the entire country, 17% of the respondents indicated that "none" of their student teachers fail; 56% reported that less than 1% fail (1-%); 13% reported that 1% fail; 9% reported that 2% fail; 2% reported that 3% fail; 1% reported that 4% fail; and 1% indicated that 5% fail. Table 34 also shows that at 8% of the responding institutions, student teachers who fail their first student teaching assignment are automatically eliminated from the teacher education program. At 41% of the institutions such students are given a second student teaching assignment after meeting whatever requirements that may be prescribed. At 25% of the institutions such students may appeal to a committee which decides on the disposition of each case. At 14% of the responding institutions some "other" alternatives are available to such students. The vast majority of these "other" alternatives consist of a combination of those already mentioned. Though not mentioned frequently, some of the more interesting "other" alternatives include: keep at it until they pass or quit; some students get incompletes, then another assignment--those who fail are out; students are assigned to laboratory school supervisor whom we feel can best help in areas of deficiency; and he may graduate without receiving a certificate to teach.

Respondents were also asked to estimate the approximate per cent of student teachers that are definitely eliminated from teacher education because they failed student teaching. Table 35 shows the results of this question. For instance, this table shows that for the entire country, 23% of the respondents indicated that "none" of their student teachers fail and are thereby eliminated from teacher education; 57% reported that less than 1% (1-%) of their student teachers are eliminated from teacher education because they failed student teaching; 10% indicated 1% are in this category; 4% of the respondents indicated 2%; 2% of the institutions indicated 3%; and 1% of the respondents indicated that 4% of their student teachers fail and are thereby eliminated from teacher education. Actually 5 institutions reported that more than 4% of their student teachers are in this category.

Table 36 shows the major causes of student teacher failure. This table shows that 23% of all respondents indicated that the major cause of student teacher failure at their institution is "inability to control students." An additional 18% of the institutions stated that "unwillingness to work" is their major cause of student teacher failure. "Poor knowledge of teaching methodology" was stated as the major cause of student teacher failure at 13% of the institutions. Nine per cent of the respondents stated that "inability to get along with other teachers" was the major reason student teachers failed at their institution. At 7% of

TABLE 34. MEAN PER CENT OF STUDENT TEACHERS FAILING FIRST ASSIGNMENT AND ALTERNATIVES AVAILABLE TO SUCH STUDENT TEACHERS.

	Per Cent Failing First Assignment							Alternatives*			
	0	1-%	1%	2%	3%	4%	5%	1	2	3	4
ALABAMA	30%	59%	6%	0%	6%	0%	0%	12%	53%	12%	6%
ALASKA	0	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	50	50	0
ARIZONA	0	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	50	50	0
ARKANSAS	20	50	20	10	0	0	0	20	20	50	0
CALIFORNIA	11	40	21	23	0	3	0	0	58	16	21
COLORADO	9	27	27	18	0	0	9	0	55	27	9
CONNECTICUT	9	55	0	9	9	0	18	0	55	18	18
DIST. OF COL.	33	50	17	0	0	0	0	0	50	0	17
FLORIDA	8	46	23	15	0	0	0	0	39	31	23
GEORGIA	18	71	6	6	0	0	0	12	29	6	35
IDAHO	0	67	0	33	0	0	0	0	100	0	0
ILLINOIS	13	58	18	5	5	0	3	8	53	23	13
INDIANA	19	42	23	8	4	0	0	12	35	23	19
IOWA	15	62	8	12	4	0	0	19	31	35	12
KANSAS	28	61	6	6	0	0	0	17	11	44	17
KENTUCKY	13	67	7	7	0	0	7	0	47	33	13
LOUISIANA	14	64	0	14	7	0	0	7	50	29	14
MAINE	30	50	10	10	0	0	0	20	30	20	20
MARYLAND	19	56	6	13	0	6	0	6	38	13	25
MASSACHUSETTS	24	42	0	24	0	3	6	12	27	27	15
MICHIGAN	80	20	0	0	0	0	0	5	50	40	5
MINNESOTA	5	65	10	15	5	0	0	0	50	30	20
MISSISSIPPI	18	54	27	0	0	0	0	0	46	27	9
MISSOURI	25	60	10	5	0	0	0	5	35	20	20
MONTANA	17	50	17	17	0	0	0	0	67	17	0
NEBRASKA	29	43	14	7	0	7	0	0	21	50	7
NEW HAMPSHIRE	38	50	0	13	0	0	0	13	50	13	0
NEW JERSEY	33	67	0	0	0	0	0	27	40	7	0
NEW MEXICO	13	50	25	0	0	0	13	25	38	38	0
NEW YORK	14	53	15	7	7	5	0	15	37	22	15
NORTH CAROLINA	18	62	7	4	0	0	0	14	29	32	14
NORTH DAKOTA	25	50	25	0	0	0	0	0	63	0	13
OHIO	10	65	10	5	2	4	0	5	53	17	19
OKLAHOMA	15	77	0	8	0	0	0	0	31	54	8
OREGON	0	36	0	54	0	9	0	0	36	46	18
PENNSYLVANIA	25	54	12	5	3	0	2	16	34	20	12
PUERTO RICO	0	100	0	0	0	0	0	50	50	0	0
RHODE ISLAND	29	29	14	0	14	14	0	0	14	14	57
SOUTH CAROLINA	19	69	12	0	0	0	0	6	38	25	19
SOUTH DAKOTA	20	70	0	10	0	0	0	10	20	40	0
TENNESSEE	21	63	16	0	0	0	0	0	47	16	16
TEXAS	12	67	17	2	2	0	0	7	38	29	17
UTAH	0	83	0	17	0	0	0	0	50	33	17
VERMONT	25	50	25	0	0	0	0	25	25	0	25
VIRGINIA	13	53	7	7	13	0	0	13	53	13	13
WASHINGTON	0	54	15	23	0	0	8	0	62	23	8
WEST VIRGINIA	14	57	21	0	0	0	7	0	71	29	0
WISCONSIN	17	54	25	4	0	0	0	4	46	25	8
UNITED STATES	17%	56%	13%	9%	2%	1%	1%	8%	41%	25%	14%

*1. Student is eliminated from teacher education.
2. Given second assignment after meeting requirements.
3. May appeal to committee.
4. Other.

2

TABLE 35. MEAN PER CENT OF STUDENT TEACHERS THAT FAIL STUDENT TEACHING AND ARE THEREBY ELIMINATED FROM TEACHER EDUCATION.

	None	1-%	1%	2%	3%	4%
ALABAMA	47%	41%	0%	6%	0%	0%
ALASKA	0	100	0	0	0	0
ARIZONA	0	100	0	0	0	0
ARKANSAS	20	60	20	0	0	0
CALIFORNIA	13	53	21	8	3	0
COLORADO	9	46	9	9	0	0
CONNECTICUT	0	64	0	0	9	27
DIST. OF COL.	17	83	0	0	0	0
FLORIDA	31	31	23	8	0	0
GEORGIA	29	53	6	6	0	0
IDAHO	0	67	33	0	0	0
ILLINOIS	15	65	13	3	5	0
INDIANA	15	65	12	4	0	0
IOWA	19	62	12	8	0	0
KANSAS	22	61	11	6	0	0
KENTUCKY	33	53	7	0	0	0
LOUISIANA	14	71	7	7	0	0
MAINE	20	60	10	0	0	0
MARYLAND	13	44	25	6	0	0
MASSACHUSETTS	21	47	9	12	6	0
MICHIGAN	20	45	20	15	0	0
MINNESOTA	20	55	10	10	5	0
MISSISSIPPI	18	55	18	0	0	0
MISSOURI	20	70	5	0	0	0
MONTANA	50	33	17	0	0	0
NEBRASKA	29	50	7	0	0	7
NEW HAMPSHIRE	38	50	0	13	0	0
NEW JERSEY	40	60	0	0	0	0
NEW MEXICO	38	50	0	0	0	0
NEW YORK	20	53	9	12	5	0
NORTH CAROLINA	32	57	4	4	0	0
NORTH DAKOTA	25	63	13	0	0	0
OHIO	21	62	12	2	2	0
OKLAHOMA	39	62	0	0	0	0
OREGON	18	36	27	0	0	9
PENNSYLVANIA	25	54	13	2	2	0
PUERTO RICO	100	0	0	0	0	0
RHODE ISLAND	43	14	29	14	0	0
SOUTH CAROLINA	50	50	0	0	0	0
SOUTH DAKOTA	30	60	10	0	0	0
TENNESSEE	21	74	0	0	0	0
TEXAS	26	67	7	0	0	0
UTAH	17	67	17	0	0	0
VERMONT	38	38	25	0	0	0
VIRGINIA	13	73	7	0	7	0
WASHINGTON	8	62	23	8	0	0
WEST VIRGINIA	21	64	0	14	0	0
WISCONSIN	29	58	13	0	0	0
UNITED STATES	23%	57%	10%	4%	2%	1%

TABLE 36. MAJOR CAUSES OF STUDENT TEACHER FAILURE.

	Major Cause of Failure*					
	1	2	3	4	5	6
ALABAMA	12%	24%	12%	6%	18%	12%
ALASKA	50	0	50	0	0	0
ARIZONA	50	0	0	50	0	0
ARKANSAS	40	10	0	10	0	20
CALIFORNIA	37	13	18	13	8	11
COLORADO	27	9	18	9	0	18
CONNECTICUT	27	0	9	9	18	18
DIST. OF COL.	17	33	17	17	0	0
FLORIDA	31	15	8	0	15	8
GEORGIA	12	6	29	0	12	12
IDAHO	0	33	0	0	0	33
ILLINOIS	35	25	8	10	5	13
INDIANA	31	12	8	4	8	19
IOWA	39	15	19	0	4	19
KANSAS	17	11	0	11	6	22
KENTUCKY	13	20	20	27	7	7
LOUISIANA	14	36	21	0	14	21
MAINE	0	30	20	0	20	20
MARYLAND	6	19	19	6	0	19
MASSACHUSETTS	15	18	12	12	3	21
MICHIGAN	15	15	30	15	0	10
MINNESOTA	15	25	15	10	15	25
MISSISSIPPI	9	9	18	18	9	18
MISSOURI	40	10	0	0	5	25
MONTANA	33	17	0	17	17	0
NEBRASKA	36	29	7	0	0	7
NEW HAMPSHIRE	38	25	0	0	0	13
NEW JERSEY	40	13	13	0	7	13
NEW MEXICO	25	38	0	25	13	0
NEW YORK	15	22	9	9	5	22
NORTH CAROLINA	18	14	14	11	11	11
NORTH DAKOTA	38	13	0	25	25	0
OHIO	17	19	21	19	2	19
OKLAHOMA	8	8	39	8	8	15
OREGON	17	9	0	9	18	9
PENNSYLVANIA	25	20	10	7	8	12
PUERTO RICO	0	0	0	0	50	0
RHODE ISLAND	43	14	0	0	14	14
SOUTH CAROLINA	13	50	6	0	0	0
SOUTH DAKOTA	30	20	10	10	20	10
TENNESSEE	11	21	26	11	16	5
TEXAS	21	21	17	21	2	14
UTAH	33	0	33	0	0	17
VERMONT	25	13	13	0	0	13
VIRGINIA	27	27	13	0	7	7
WASHINGTON	39	8	23	15	0	15
WEST VIRGINIA	21	21	7	7	14	29
WISCONSIN	21	13	13	8	4	13
UNITED STATES	23%	18%	13%	9%	7%	15%

*1. Inability to Control Students
2. Unwillingness to Work
3. Poor Knowledge of Teaching Methodology
4. Inability to Get Along with Other Teachers
5. Poor Subject Matter Background
6. Other

the institutions "poor subject matter background" is the major cause of student teacher failure. Fifteen per cent of the respondents listed some "other" major cause of student teacher failure; the most frequently mentioned of these being personality conflicts, emotional problems, and personal problems. Many of the respondents mentioned that they had had so few failures that it was difficult to generalize about the causes.

Table 37 shows the per cent of respondents that employ the student teaching center concept as well as the mean number of such centers. This table shows that 22% of all respondents do place their student teachers in centers. Furthermore, table 37 shows that the mean number of elementary centers that these institutions have is 8; the mean number of secondary centers is 9; and the mean total number of centers is 14.

Item 51 on the questionnaire represented an attempt to determine the extent to which institutions are actually using some of the rather widely discussed innovations that are available for use in student teaching programs today. Tables 38 through 42 show the results of this item.

Table 38 shows the extent to which institutions are using video-taping equipment and/or tape recorders with their student teachers. Concerning the use of video-taping equipment, this table shows that 47% of the institutions in the country are not using such equipment at all; 31% are using it a small amount; 13% are using it a good deal; 3% extensively; and 1% of the people filling out the questionnaire said they did not know to what extent video-taping equipment was being used with student teachers. Regarding the use of audio tape recorders, table 38 shows that 11% of all respondents reported they did not use such equipment at all with student teachers; 54% reported using tape recorders a small amount with their student teachers; 25% indicated such equipment is used a good deal; and 6% said such equipment is used extensively. One per cent of the respondents indicated that they did not know how extensively tape recorders are being used with their student teachers.

Table 39 also deals with innovations. This table shows that 47% of all respondents reported they did not use micro teaching prior to or during student teaching; 28% reported using micro teaching a small amount; 12% a good deal; 4% extensively; while 1% did not know how extensively micro teaching is being used at their institutions. This same table shows that 22% of all respondents are not using simulation techniques prior to or during student teaching at all; 35% are using such techniques a small amount; 28% a good deal; 8% extensively; and 1% reported they did not know how extensively simulation techniques are being used at their institutions.

Table 40 indicates the extent to which the Flander's interaction analysis technique and/or the Taba's teaching strategies material is being used with student teachers. For instance, this table shows that 52% of all

TABLE 37. USE OF THE STUDENT TEACHING CENTER CONCEPT AND MEAN NUMBER OF SUCH CENTERS.

	Have Student Teaching Centers	Mean Number of Such Centers		
		Elementary	Secondary	Total
ALABAMA	29%	10	9	18
ALASKA	0	0	0	0
ARIZONA	0	0	0	0
ARKANSAS	10	3	4	7
CALIFORNIA	11	2	3	4
COLORADO	18	1	3	2
CONNECTICUT	18	4	1	5
DIST. OF COL.	17	2	1	3
FLORIDA	31	18	21	39
GEORGIA	53	7	9	14
IDAHO	0	0	0	0
ILLINOIS	30	8	5	13
INDIANA	12	16	20	16
IOWA	23	6	10	15
KANSAS	6	5	4	5
KENTUCKY	13	20	15	35
LOUISIANA	21	4	4	7
MAINE	0	0	0	0
MARYLAND	6	12	0	12
MASSACHUSETTS	33	4	3	6
MICHIGAN	30	6	9	6
MINNESOTA	15	15	38	29
MISSISSIPPI	27	8	12	15
MISSOURI	20	3	3	5
MONTANA	67	7	6	10
NEBRASKA	14	8	30	16
NEW HAMPSHIRE	13	2	2	4
NEW JERSEY	20	11	8	19
NEW MEXICO	25	6	5	6
NEW YORK	32	13	10	17
NORTH CAROLINA	18	5	5	10
NORTH DAKOTA	38	8	15	18
OHIO	19	7	4	6
OKLAHOMA	23	9	11	16
OREGON	0	1	1	1
PENNSYLVANIA	18	10	9	16
PUERTO RICO	50	5	23	38
RHODE ISLAND	14	0	12	12
SOUTH CAROLINA	19	3	5	6
SOUTH DAKOTA	20	7	13	7
TENNESSEE	26	7	29	34
TEXAS	24	12	11	19
UTAH	33	3	1	4
VERMONT	13	5	10	15
VIRGINIA	13	5	5	9
WASHINGTON	23	7	7	14
WEST VIRGINIA	29	6	8	14
WISCONSIN	8	10	9	18
UNITED STATES	22%	8	9	14

TABLE 38. USE OF VIDEO-TAPE EQUIPMENT AND TAPE RECORDERS WITH STUDENT TEACHERS.

	Use of Video-Tape Equipment					Use of Tape Recorders				
	Not at All	A Small Amount	A Good Deal	Extensively	Don't Know	Not at All	A Small Amount	A Good Deal	Extensively	Don't Know
ALABAMA	47%	29%	6%	0%	0%	6%	77%	12%	0%	0%
ALASKA	50	50	0	0	0	0	100	0	0	0
ARIZONA	50	50	0	0	0	50	50	0	0	0
ARKANSAS	80	10	10	0	0	30	50	20	0	0
CALIFORNIA	42	40	11	5	0	8	63	24	3	3
COLORADO	27	46	18	9	0	9	73	18	0	0
CONNECTICUT	18	36	18	0	0	9	46	18	0	0
DIST. OF COL.	33	50	17	0	0	17	33	50	0	0
FLORIDA	62	31	8	0	0	0	69	31	0	0
GEORGIA	53	24	18	0	0	24	35	35	6	0
IDAHO	33	33	33	0	0	0	67	33	0	0
ILLINOIS	48	25	23	0	0	18	68	13	3	0
INDIANA	54	31	8	4	0	4	62	23	8	0
IOWA	50	27	19	4	0	0	62	23	15	0
KANSAS	39	11	33	17	0	11	44	39	6	0
KENTUCKY	53	27	13	0	0	7	47	33	13	0
LOUISIANA	71	21	7	0	0	14	57	29	0	0
MAINE	60	30	10	0	0	20	60	20	0	0
MARYLAND	50	25	6	0	6	19	44	31	0	0
MASSACHUSETTS	33	46	15	0	0	21	55	12	6	0
MICHIGAN	55	35	5	5	0	0	80	10	5	0
MINNESOTA	55	35	5	0	0	15	65	10	10	0
MISSISSIPPI	46	27	0	0	0	0	64	18	9	0
MISSOURI	50	35	15	0	0	30	35	30	5	0
MONTANA	33	50	0	0	0	17	67	17	0	0
NEBRASKA	29	50	14	0	0	0	50	29	0	7
NEW HAMPSHIRE	25	25	38	0	0	13	25	38	25	0
NEW JERSEY	53	33	0	0	7	13	53	27	0	0
NEW MEXICO	50	13	38	0	0	13	50	13	25	0
NEW YORK	34	46	12	2	2	7	53	25	9	2
NORTH CAROLINA	46	29	14	4	0	14	54	25	4	0
NORTH DAKOTA	38	25	13	0	0	13	50	38	0	0
OHIO	4	45	5	5	0	7	57	29	2	2
OKLAHOMA	62	8	8	8	0	15	54	15	0	0
OREGON	27	36	9	18	0	0	36	55	9	0
PENNSYLVANIA	48	21	16	3	2	10	46	28	15	0
PUERTO RICO	50	50	0	0	0	0	50	50	0	0
RHODE ISLAND	43	57	0	0	0	0	100	0	0	0
SOUTH CAROLINA	56	19	13	6	0	13	44	38	6	0
SOUTH DAKOTA	80	0	20	0	0	10	60	10	20	0
TENNESSEE	63	32	0	0	0	32	42	21	0	0
TEXAS	50	24	19	5	0	14	50	26	2	0
UTAH	17	50	33	0	0	0	50	33	0	17
VERMONT	38	25	13	13	0	0	25	63	13	0
VIRGINIA	47	33	13	7	0	20	60	13	0	7
WASHINGTON	54	31	15	0	0	8	39	31	23	0
WEST VIRGINIA	57	21	7	0	0	21	43	21	0	0
WISCONSIN	58	25	13	0	0	4	50	42	0	0
UNITED STATES	47%	31%	13%	3%	1%	11%	54%	25%	6%	1%

TABLE 39. USE OF MICRO TEACHING AND THE SIMULATION TECHNIQUE PRIOR TO OR DURING STUDENT TEACHING.

	Use of Micro Teaching					Use of the Simulation Technique				
	Not at All	A Small Amount	A Good Deal	Exten-sively	Don't Know	Not at All	A Small Amount	A Good Deal	Exten-sively	Don't Know
ALABAMA	41%	35%	6%	0%	0%	18%	24%	29%	0%	0%
ALASKA	50	50	0	0	0	0	50	50	0	0
ARIZONA	50	50	0	0	0	0	0	100	0	0
ARKANSAS	70	10	0	0	10	40	10	40	0	0
CALIFORNIA	47	34	5	5	3	26	37	21	8	3
COLORADO	27	46	18	0	0	9	27	36	18	0
CONNECTICUT	18	27	9	0	0	9	36	27	0	0
DIST. OF COL.	67	33	0	0	0	33	17	50	0	0
FLORIDA	62	15	15	0	8	15	46	15	8	15
GEORGIA	65	12	18	6	0	19	18	47	6	0
IDAHO	33	67	0	0	0	33	33	33	0	0
ILLINOIS	38	35	18	3	5	33	35	10	8	3
INDIANA	46	42	0	4	0	15	35	23	15	8
IOWA	46	35	19	0	0	33	42	27	4	4
KANSAS	44	17	28	11	0	33	33	33	0	0
KENTUCKY	40	33	13	0	0	13	27	40	13	0
LOUISIANA	57	14	29	0	0	14	43	36	7	0
MAINE	50	20	20	0	0	40	20	40	0	0
MARYLAND	63	19	6	0	6	19	25	44	0	0
MASSACHUSETTS	49	24	12	3	0	24	36	18	9	3
MICHIGAN	40	50	0	0	0	30	35	20	5	0
MINNESOTA	45	30	15	10	0	15	40	35	5	0
MISSISSIPPI	46	18	9	0	0	18	36	9	27	0
MISSOURI	30	50	15	0	0	25	30	40	5	0
MONTANA	33	33	0	0	0	0	33	50	0	17
NEBRASKA	43	36	7	7	0	7	29	36	21	0
NEW HAMPSHIRE	63	25	0	0	0	0	25	63	0	0
NEW JERSEY	60	27	7	0	0	20	13	40	13	0
NEW MEXICO	50	0	50	0	0	13	38	50	0	0
NEW YORK	44	24	17	2.	5	24	46	20	3	0
NORTH CAROLINA	54	18	11	4	4	11	32	39	11	0
NORTH DAKOTA	38	25	0	13	0	25	38	13	13	0
OHIO	43	38	10	2	0	12	48	33	5	0
OKLAHOMA	46	0	15	23	0	23	23	15	15	0
OREGON	36	27	18	18	0	9	36	18	18	0
PENNSYLVANIA	44	31	15	3	0	19	39	26	10	2
PUERTO RICO	50	50	0	0	0	50	50	0	0	0
RHODE ISLAND	71	29	0	0	0	14	57	29	0	0
SOUTH CAROLINA	56	31	6	6	0	25	13	31	25	6
SOUTH DAKOTA	100	0	0	0	0	10	70	20	0	0
TENNESSEE	47	32	5	0	0	37	37	11	0	0
TEXAS	50	19	17	5	0	29	33	24	5	2
UTAH	17	33	17	33	0	17	50	0	33	0
VERMONT	13	38	13	13	0	0	38	25	25	0
VIRGINIA	73	13	13	0	0	13	40	27	7	0
WASHINGTON	46	23	23	8	0	15	23	31	31	0
WEST VIRGINIA	50	21	7	7	0	36	7	36	14	0
WISCONSIN	46	29	13	4	0	38	38	21	0	0
UNITED STATES	47%	28%	12%	4%	1%	22%	35%	28%	8%	1%

TABLE 40. USE OF THE FLANDER'S INTERACTION ANALYSIS TECHNIQUE AND TABA'S TEACHING STRATEGIES MATERIAL DURING STUDENT TEACHING.

	Use of Flander's Interaction Analysis Technique					Use of Taba's Teaching Strategies Material				
	Not at All	A Small Amount	A Good Deal	Extensively	Don't Know	Not at All	A Small Amount	A Good Deal	Extensively	Don't Know
ALABAMA	47%	29%	6%	0%	0%	47%	18%	6%	0%	6%
ALASKA	0	50	50	0	0	0	0	50	50	0
ARIZONA	50	50	0	0	0	50	50	0	0	0
ARKANSAS	70	10	10	0	10	80	0	10	0	10
CALIFORNIA	47	32	3	3	3	55	18	5	5	8
COLORADO	46	36	0	9	0	64	18	0	0	9
CONNECTICUT	46	18	0	0	0	46	9	0	9	8
DIST. OF COL.	50	0	33	0	17	67	0	33	0	0
FLORIDA	62	23	8	0	8	62	23	0	0	15
GEORGIA	82	12	6	0	0	82	12	0	0	6
IDAHO	33	67	0	0	0	100	0	0	0	0
ILLINOIS	50	33	8	0	5	68	8	5	0	13
INDIANA	58	12	8	4	8	65	15	0	0	8
IOWA	50	31	8	4	4	73	12	0	0	12
KANSAS	33	44	11	6	6	83	6	0	0	11
KENTUCKY	60	13	7	7	0	80	0	0	0	7
LOUISIANA	79	14	0	0	7	85	7	0	0	7
MAINE	60	30	0	0	0	70	20	0	0	0
MARYLAND	69	19	0	0	6	75	6	6	0	6
MASSACHUSETTS	52	24	3	0	12	67	12	3	0	9
MICHIGAN	45	30	10	0	5	60	15	0	0	10
MINNESOTA	60	10	25	0	0	75	5	5	0	5
MISSISSIPPI	46	36	0	0	0	64	18	0	0	0
MISSOURI	70	25	0	0	0	80	10	0	0	5
MONTANA	50	17	17	0	0	33	17	33	0	0
NEBRASKA	50	29	14	0	0	71	14	0	0	7
NEW HAMPSHIRE	50	0	13	0	13	38	13	13	0	13
NEW JERSEY	53	13	13	0	7	67	7	7	0	7
NEW MEXICO	50	25	13	0	13	50	38	13	0	0
NEW YORK	36	36	7	3	9	56	15	3	0	14
NORTH CAROLINA	61	14	4	0	0	68	7	0	0	4
NORTH DAKOTA	50	25	0	0	0	75	0	0	0	0
OHIO	50	31	7	7	0	71	14	0	0	7
OKLAHOMA	62	15	8	0	0	69	15	0	0	0
OREGON	18	9	64	9	0	27	27	36	9	0
PENNSYLVANIA	36	33	13	3	5	64	18	3	0	3
PUERTO RICO	100	0	0	0	0	100	0	0	0	0
RHODE ISLAND	43	43	0	0	14	86	0	0	0	14
SOUTH CAROLINA	81	19	0	0	0	75	13	6	0	6
SOUTH DAKOTA	80	10	0	0	10	90	0	0	0	10
TENNESSEE	53	21	5	0	0	68	11	0	0	0
TEXAS	67	19	2	2	0	71	14	5	0	0
UTAH	0	83	17	0	0	17	67	0	17	0
VERMONT	38	25	13	0	0	50	0	0	0	13
VIRGINIA	80	7	0	7	7	87	0	0	0	13
WASHINGTON	39	39	15	8	0	62	23	15	0	0
WEST VIRGINIA	50	29	7	0	0	64	7	0	0	14
WISCONSIN	38	42	13	0	4	67	13	4	0	8
UNITED STATES	52%	26%	8%	2%	4%	66%	13%	4%	1%	7%

respondents do not use the Flander's interaction analysis technique at all; 26% use it a small amount; 8% reported using this technique a good deal; while 4% use this technique extensively. Four per cent of the respondents indicated they did not know how extensively this technique is used at their institutions.

Table 40 further shows that 66% of all respondents do not use the Taba's teaching strategies material at all during student teaching; 13% use this material a small amount; 4% a good deal; 1% extensively; and 7% indicated they did not know how extensively this material is used with their student teachers.

Table 41 indicates that 45% of all respondents do not use Bloom's taxonomy of educational objectives material at all with their student teachers; 25% use this material a small amount; 13% a good deal; 3% extensively; and 5% did not know to what extent this material is being used with their student teachers.

Table 41 also shows that 45% of all respondents do not use sensitivity training at all with their student teachers; 24% use it a small amount; 11% a good deal; 3% extensively; and 7% reported they did not know to what extent sensitivity training is being used with their student teachers.

Table 42 shows the extent of the use of small group seminars with student teachers. Two per cent of all respondents reported that they did not use such seminars at all; 11% indicated they used small group seminars with student teachers a small amount; 31% a good deal; 53% extensively; and 3 respondents reported they did not know how extensively such seminars are used at their institutions (however, these constitute less than one-half of one per cent and therefore are reported as 0% on table 42).

Cooperating School Districts and Cooperating Teachers. Items 52 through 63 on the questionnaire dealt with cooperating school districts and cooperating teachers. This section of the report shows the information generated by these items.

Table 43 shows the per cent of institutions that have written contracts with cooperating schools and also the total number of cooperating teachers utilized during the 1966-67 school year. This table shows that 38% of all responding institutions have written contracts with their cooperating schools. Table 43 also shows that 11% of the responding institutions utilized fewer than 25 cooperating teachers during the 1966-67 school year; 23% utilized from 26 to 50 cooperating teachers; 25% utilized from 51 to 100 cooperating teachers; 18% utilized from 101 to 200 cooperating teachers; 13% utilized from 201 to 500 cooperating teachers; 7% utilized from 501-1,000 cooperating teachers; 1% utilized from 1,001 to 1,500 cooperating teachers; and 1% utilized from 1,501 to 2,000 cooperating teachers during the 1966-67 school year.

TABLE 41. USE OF BLOOM'S TAXONOMY OF EDUCATIONAL OBJECTIVES MATERIAL AND SENSITIVITY TRAINING WITH STUDENT TEACHERS.

	Use of Bloom's Taxonomy of Ed. Objectives Material					Use of Sensitivity Training				
	Not at All	A Small Amount	A Good Deal	Extensively	Don't Know	Not at All	A Small Amount	A Good Deal	Extensively	Don't Know
ALABAMA	18%	18%	35%	12%	0%	47%	18%	12%	0%	6%
ALASKA	0	50	50	0	0	0	100	0	0	0
ARIZONA	100	0	0	0	0	0	100	0	0	0
ARKANSAS	60	0	30	0	10	50	10	20	0	10
CALIFORNIA	32	29	21	8	5	32	42	11	3	8
COLORADO	64	18	0	0	9	73	9	18	0	0
CONNECTICUT	36	36	0	0	0	36	18	0	9	0
DIST. OF COL.	83	17	0	0	0	33	50	17	0	0
FLORIDA	31	31	15	23	0	39	39	8	8	8
GEORGIA	71	18	6	0	6	53	24	12	0	6
IDAHO	100	0	0	0	0	67	33	0	0	0
ILLINOIS	48	30	8	0	8	40	28	18	3	8
INDIANA	42	23	19	0	8	42	31	4	4	12
IOWA	19	39	23	4	12	46	23	12	8	8
KANSAS	67	11	6	6	11	56	6	22	0	17
KENTUCKY	67	13	0	0	7	40	27	0	7	13
LOUISIANA	57	21	7	7	7	50	21	14	0	7
MAINE	50	30	10	0	0	60	30	10	0	0
MARYLAND	63	13	13	0	6	69	13	13	0	0
MASSACHUSETTS	42	21	15	0	9	58	9	12	3	9
MICHIGAN	40	20	25	0	10	45	25	10	0	10
MINNESOTA	30	40	25	5	0	55	20	5	0	20
MISSISSIPPI	36	27	0	0	9	46	18	18	0	0
MISSOURI	45	30	15	0	5	55	25	5	0	5
MONTANA	17	33	33	0	0	17	17	17	0	17
NEBRASKA	57	29	7	0	0	29	21	14	0	21
NEW HAMPSHIRE	25	25	25	0	13	25	25	25	0	13
NEW JERSEY	60	7	13	0	7	40	20	20	7	0
NEW MEXICO	25	50	25	0	0	63	25	13	0	0
NEW YORK	48	20	9	2	10	51	22	5	0	9
NORTH CAROLINA	46	18	16	0	0	46	14	11	11	0
NORTH DAKOTA	50	13	13	0	0	63	25	0	0	0
OHIO	43	14	10	0	5	38	43	5	0	2
OKLAHOMA	39	15	15	15	0	46	23	15	0	0
OREGON	18	18	46	18	0	27	36	36	0	0
PENNSYLVANIA	34	31	15	2	3	30	26	12	7	13
PUERTO RICO	50	0	50	0	0	50	50	0	0	0
RHODE ISLAND	71	14	0	0	14	57	14	0	0	29
SOUTH CAROLINA	50	25	6	13	6	69	0	13	13	6
SOUTH DAKOTA	90	10	0	0	0	60	20	10	0	10
TENNESSEE	53	21	5	0	0	42	21	11	0	0
TEXAS	55	29	5	2	0	50	17	17	0	2
UTAH	33	67	0	0	0	0	83	0	17	0
VERMONT	38	0	38	0	0	25	25	0	13	0
VIRGINIA	53	13	20	0	13	53	27	7	0	13
WASHINGTON	23	54	23	0	0	54	31	15	0	0
WEST VIRGINIA	64	14	0	7	0	50	21	0	14	0
WISCONSIN	29	33	29	4	0	46	25	8	4	13
UNITED STATES	45%	25%	13%	3%	5%	45%	24%	11%	3%	7%

TABLE 42. USE OF SMALL GROUP SEMINARS WITH STUDENT TEACHERS.

	Not at All	A Small Amount	A Good Deal	Exten- sively	Don't Know
ALABAMA	0%	0%	29%	71%	0%
ALASKA	0	0	50	50	0
ARIZONA	0	100	0	0	0
ARKANSAS	0	10	40	50	0
CALIFORNIA	3	13	32	53	0
COLORADO	9	9	27	55	0
CONNECTICUT	0	27	18	46	0
DIST. OF COL.	0	0	50	50	0
FLORIDA	0	0	31	69	0
GEORGIA	0	24	18	59	0
IDAHO	0	0	67	33	0
ILLINOIS	5	10	33	53	0
INDIANA	0	27	27	42	0
IOWA	0	4	35	62	0
KANSAS	6	0	39	50	6
KENTUCKY	0	0	13	87	0
LOUISIANA	0	14	29	57	0
MAINE	0	40	40	20	0
MARYLAND	0	13	31	56	0
MASSACHUSETTS	6	15	27	49	0
MICHIGAN	0	10	30	60	0
MINNESOTA	5	10	40	45	0
MISSISSIPPI	0	9	46	46	0
MISSOURI	5	15	50	30	0
MONTANA	0	17	17	67	0
NEBRASKA	0	14	29	43	7
NEW HAMPSHIRE	0	0	38	50	13
NEW JERSEY	7	27	13	47	0
NEW MEXICO	0	0	38	63	0
NEW YORK	0	5	32	59	0
NORTH CAROLINA	4	11	43	43	0
NORTH DAKOTA	0	0	50	50	0
OHIO	2	7	26	62	0
OKLAHOMA	0	15	54	23	0
OREGON	0	9	27	64	0
PENNSYLVANIA	2	13	18	64	0
PUERTO RICO	0	50	0	50	0
RHODE ISLAND	0	43	14	43	0
SOUTH CAROLINA	0	6	31	63	0
SOUTH DAKOTA	0	40	30	30	0
TENNESSEE	5	11	21	63	0
TEXAS	2	12	24	57	0
UTAH	0	0	33	67	0
VERMONT	0	0	63	25	0
VIRGINIA	7	20	20	47	0
WASHINGTON	0	0	39	62	0
WEST VIRGINIA	0	7	50	43	0
WISCONSIN	0	4	33	58	0
UNITED STATES	2%	11%	31%	53%	0%

TABLE 43. WRITTEN CONTRACTS WITH COOPERATING SCHOOLS AND TOTAL NUMBER OF COOPERATING TEACHERS UTILIZED DURING 1966-67 SCHOOL YEAR.

	Have Written Contracts	Total Number of Coop. Teachers, 1966-67							
		Under 25	26-50	51-100	101-200	201-500	501-1,000	1,001-1,500	1,501-2,000
ALABAMA	65%	12%	24%	24%	18%	18%	0%	6%	0%
ALASKA	0	50	50	0	0	0	0	0	0
ARIZONA	100	0	0	50	0	0	50	0	0
ARKANSAS	40	0	20	20	40	20	0	0	0
CALIFORNIA	82	16	16	24	18	13	11	0	0
COLORADO	18	0	18	18	18	36	0	0	9
CONNECTICUT	18	18	9	18	27	9	18	0	0
DIST. OF COL.	0	17	33	17	33	0	0	0	0
FLORIDA	92	8	8	23	23	15	23	0	0
GEORGIA	35	12	18	41	24	6	0	0	0
IDAHO	67	0	0	67	33	0	0	0	0
ILLINOIS	38	18	23	23	13	18	5	3	0
INDIANA	17	12	27	31	12	4	12	0	4
IOWA	69	4	19	50	15	8	4	0	0
KANSAS	50	11	33	22	0	28	6	0	0
KENTUCKY	53	0	53	20	7	13	7	0	0
LOUISIANA	71	7	14	57	14	7	0	0	0
MAINE	20	60	10	10	0	20	0	0	0
MARYLAND	13	31	44	6	6	6	6	0	0
MASSACHUSETTS	18	15	21	12	36	6	6	0	3
MICHIGAN	25	0	35	20	15	15	5	5	5
MINNESOTA	60	0	15	35	30	10	5	5	0
MISSISSIPPI	55	9	18	9	18	36	0	0	0
MISSOURI	5	10	30	15	20	15	5	0	5
MONTANA	17	17	33	17	17	17	0	0	0
NEBRASKA	21	0	29	14	29	14	14	0	0
NEW HAMPSHIRE	0	25	38	13	0	13	0	0	0
NEW JERSEY	47	27	27	0	13	0	27	7	0
NEW MEXICO	38	0	38	25	13	25	0	0	0
NEW YORK	14	14	24	19	9	17	10	3	2
NORTH CAROLINA	11	0	21	46	18	11	4	0	0
NORTH DAKOTA	63	0	38	25	25	13	0	0	0
OHIO	24	5	14	29	31	7	12	2	0
OKLAHOMA	23	0	0	39	15	31	8	8	0
OREGON	91	18	18	27	9	27	0	0	0
PENNSYLVANIA	33	15	28	26	10	12	7	0	0
PUERTO RICO	0	50	0	0	50	0	0	0	0
RHODE ISLAND	14	14	14	43	14	0	14	0	0
SOUTH CAROLINA	25	6	19	63	0	13	0	0	0
SOUTH DAKOTA	80	0	30	20	30	20	0	0	0
TENNESSEE	32	11	16	26	32	16	0	0	0
TEXAS	67	10	19	24	14	21	10	0	0
UTAH	17	0	0	0	17	17	33	17	0
VERMONT	13	25	38	13	25	0	0	0	0
VIRGINIA	20	13	27	20	20	20	0	0	0
WASHINGTON	39	15	15	8	23	15	23	0	0
WEST VIRGINIA	79	0	36	21	29	14	0	0	0
WISCONSIN	21	8	25	33	17	8	8	0	0
UNITED STATES	38%	11%	23%	25%	18%	13%	7%	1%	1%

Table 44 shows the mean distance that student teachers are placed from campus. For the elementary student teachers at all responding institutions, the mean minimum distance is 3 miles, the mean average distance is 18 miles, and the mean maximum distance is 56 miles. Likewise, for secondary student teachers, the mean minimum distance is 3 miles, the mean average distance is 21 miles, and the mean maximum distance is 64 miles.

Table 45 deals with the methods that are used to train cooperating teachers. The table shows that 52% of the respondents conduct small seminars with cooperating teachers; 33% hold workshops for cooperating teachers; 31% hold larger conferences on student teaching; 27% offer a formal course in the supervision of student teaching; 27% mail out student teaching newsletters to cooperating teachers; 12% send cooperating teachers to state conferences dealing with student teaching; 3% send cooperating teachers to national conferences dealing with student teaching; while 26% of the respondents listed some "other" technique that they use to train cooperating teachers. Of these, the most frequently mentioned were: providing the cooperating teacher with a student teaching handbook; and holding individual conferences between the college supervisor and the cooperating teacher. Though not mentioned frequently, some of the more interesting training techniques listed were: an NDEA institute on campus for cooperating teachers; all training done through clinical professors; Association for Student Teaching materials sent to cooperating teachers; and provide cooperating teachers with membership in AST.

Table 46 shows the major characteristics sought in cooperating teachers. This table shows that 45% of the respondents listed willingness to work with student teachers as the major characteristic they seek in a cooperating teacher; 24% listed human relations skills; 15% listed knowledge of teaching methodology; 12% listed possession of a bachelor's degree; 11% listed subject matter competency; 3% listed possession of a master's degree; 3% listed possession of a certificate for this type of work; 3 respondents listed having taken a course in the supervision of student teaching (but they constitute less than one-half of one per cent and are therefore reported as 0% on table 46); and 4% listed some "other" major characteristic they seek in cooperating teachers. The most frequently listed of these other characteristics were: recommendation of the principal; and successful teaching experience. In viewing table 46, it should be noted that the percentages shown for the United States total 117%. This is due to the fact that some respondents listed two or more major characteristics.

Respondents were asked: "to what extent do your cooperating teachers exemplify the competencies that you consider to be most important for helping a student teacher." The results of this question is shown in table 47. As this table shows, 7% stated that they are almost completely satisfied with the competency of their cooperating teachers; 44% stated that they are very

TABLE 44. MEAN DISTANCE FROM CAMPUS THAT STUDENT TEACHERS ARE PLACED.

	Mean Distance In Miles					
	Elementary Student Teachers			Secondary Student Teachers		
	Minimum	Average	Maximum	Minimum	Average	Maximum
ALABAMA	1	26	61	1	30	80
ALASKA	2	6	9	1	6	6
ARIZONA	1	6	113	1	6	113
ARKANSAS	6	25	71	6	29	76
CALIFORNIA	2	9	23	2	10	30
COLORADO	1	43	144	1	48	148
CONNECTICUT	1	11	37	1	13	46
DIST. OF COL.	2	5	12	2	5	12
FLORIDA	2	53	132	2	48	119
GEORGIA	2	26	64	2	26	65
IDAHO	1	18	56	1	19	60
ILLINOIS	4	13	46	3	13	46
INDIANA	2	17	67	2	20	76
IOWA	1	14	38	1	17	49
KANSAS	1	12	43	1	13	46
KENTUCKY	3	20	54	3	20	60
LOUISIANA	2	11	26	2	12	30
MAINE	2	16	30	3	44	94
MARYLAND	1	15	72	2	14	38
MASSACHUSETTS	2	11	31	2	12	43
MICHIGAN	1	12	54	1	24	104
MINNESOTA	17	53	151	4	28	66
MISSISSIPPI	6	39	118	6	41	125
MISSOURI	3	13	38	3	18	53
MONTANA	2	38	126	2	38	126
NEBRASKA	1	56	122	2	67	147
NEW HAMPSHIRE	8	23	54	5	25	73
NEW JERSEY	1	13	40	2	17	53
NEW MEXICO	2	15	48	2	11	64
NEW YORK	2	21	74	2	22	74
NORTH CAROLINA	3	20	69	3	23	85
NORTH DAKOTA	0	14	105	1	21	142
OHIO	1	8	27	2	9	32
OKLAHOMA	1	24	67	1	24	74
OREGON	1	10	27	2	12	35
PENNSYLVANIA	6	19	44	8	19	41
PUERTO RICO	1	2	3	1	5	10
RHODE ISLAND	2	12	95	2	14	79
SOUTH CAROLINA	1	20	48	1	26	57
SOUTH DAKOTA	1	17	69	1	43	155
TENNESSEE	4	10	25	4	29	62
TEXAS	1	14	42	2	14	42
UTAH	1	13	108	1	14	140
VERMONT	3	16	53	2	15	56
VIRGINIA	5	18	51	5	22	61
WASHINGTON	3	25	85	3	30	125
WEST VIRGINIA	2	11	39	2	13	53
WISCONSIN	2	12	44	2	15	53
UNITED STATES	3	18	56	3	21	64

TABLE 45. METHODS USED TO TRAIN COOPERATING TEACHERS.

	Methods Used*							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
ALABAMA	71%	29%	29%	35%	24%	29%	6%	6%
ALASKA	0	50	0	50	0	0	0	0
ARIZONA	0	0	50	50	100	0	0	0
ARKANSAS	40	10	30	10	30	0	0	30
CALIFORNIA	55	21	34	32	18	0	0	29
COLORADO	27	27	9	64	9	18	0	27
CONNECTICUT	36	36	46	18	36	18	0	18
DIST. OF COL.	50	83	67	33	33	0	0	33
FLORIDA	54	54	54	54	69	0	0	8
GEORGIA	65	41	35	59	12	47	0	29
IDAHO	100	0	0	33	0	0	0	0
ILLINOIS	45	40	8	20	38	8	5	23
INDIANA	42	42	39	27	50	12	4	39
IOWA	65	31	23	15	31	15	0	39
KANSAS	61	28	33	28	33	6	0	22
KENTUCKY	60	60	60	87	33	13	7	20
LOUISIANA	64	43	64	71	14	50	21	21
MAINE	30	60	50	30	50	20	0	0
MARYLAND	50	38	44	13	38	25	19	25
MASSACHUSETTS	49	21	33	61	3	9	3	39
MICHIGAN	75	25	55	50	40	25	10	20
MINNESOTA	45	50	15	25	25	5	5	35
MISSISSIPPI	46	18	18	64	36	27	9	9
MISSOURI	60	20	15	5	35	5	5	30
MONTANA	83	17	0	33	0	17	0	17
NEBRASKA	43	64	29	21	50	21	0	7
NEW HAMPSHIRE	50	38	0	38	38	0	0	25
NEW JERSEY	40	7	60	7	13	0	0	47
NEW MEXICO	63	63	0	38	25	0	0	13
NEW YORK	54	31	29	24	25	9	2	20
NORTH CAROLINA	61	49	36	25	7	14	0	32
NORTH DAKOTA	63	25	63	63	50	25	13	25
OHIO	43	19	62	12	33	2	2	36
OKLAHOMA	46	23	15	8	46	0	0	23
OREGON	64	46	36	46	9	0	0	36
PENNSYLVANIA	59	39	34	12	31	21	2	25
PUERTO RICO	50	50	50	50	0	0	0	0
RHODE ISLAND	0	14	57	71	14	14	0	29
SOUTH CAROLINA	50	44	31	13	44	6	0	6
SOUTH DAKOTA	60	30	10	30	20	0	0	30
TENNESSEE	58	26	47	26	16	5	0	26
TEXAS	45	29	12	7	14	14	0	31
UTAH	50	33	33	67	33	0	0	17
VERMONT	25	38	38	13	38	13	0	38
VIRGINIA	60	33	40	13	7	20	0	33
WASHINGTON	23	46	23	46	23	0	0	49
WEST VIRGINIA	64	36	43	26	36	7	14	43
WISCONSIN	50	29	13	46	25	8	4	29
UNITED STATES	52%	33%	31%	27%	27%	12%	3%	26%

*1. Seminars for coop. teachers	5. Newsletter mailed to coop. teachers
2. Workshops for coop. teachers	6. Sending coop. teachers to state meetings
3. Conferences for coop. teachers	7. Sending coop. teachers to national meetings
4. Formal course	8. Other

TABLE 46. CHARACTERISTICS SOUGHT IN COOPERATING TEACHERS.

	Characteristics Sought*								
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
ALABAMA	47%	29%	12%	6%	18%	0%	6%	0%	0%
ALASKA	50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
ARIZONA	50	0	0	50	0	0	0	0	0
ARKANSAS	60	10	10	30	0	0	0	0	0
CALIFORNIA	29	47	21	3	13	0	3	0	5
COLORADO	55	18	18	9	0	0	0	0	0
CONNECTICUT	27	18	18	18	9	0	0	0	18
DIST. OF COL.	67	17	17	0	0	0	0	17	0
FLORIDA	23	8	31	15	15	0	0	0	8
GEORGIA	59	35	6	12	0	0	6	0	0
IDAHO	33	0	0	33	0	0	33	0	0
ILLINOIS	50	8	18	10	10	5	8	0	0
INDIANA	31	27	12	15	0	35	0	0	0
IOWA	46	19	19	8	4	4	0	0	0
KANSAS	39	39	22	17	11	0	0	0	6
KENTUCKY	40	27	7	13	7	7	0	0	0
LOUISIANA	29	14	0	7	7	14	29	0	7
MAINE	10	40	20	20	0	10	0	0	0
MARYLAND	44	6	25	6	13	0	0	6	6
MASSACHUSETTS	55	15	9	6	12	3	3	0	9
MICHIGAN	45	20	15	15	5	0	0	0	0
MINNESOTA	55	25	10	20	0	0	0	0	0
MISSISSIPPI	27	36	9	18	11	0	27	0	0
MISSOURI	50	30	15	15	10	0	0	0	0
MONTANA	50	17	17	0	0	0	0	0	17
NEBRASKA	36	36	14	36	7	0	0	0	7
NEW HAMPSHIRE	38	25	38	0	13	13	0	0	13
NEW JERSEY	47	33	27	7	20	0	7	0	0
NEW MEXICO	25	25	25	13	0	13	0	0	0
NEW YORK	53	14	17	3	12	0	2	0	10
NORTH CAROLINA	36	29	7	11	14	4	0	0	14
NORTH DAKOTA	38	13	0	25	0	0	0	0	25
OHIO	67	19	10	14	12	2	0	0	2
OKLAHOMA	62	8	0	23	15	0	0	0	0
OREGON	36	46	0	9	9	0	0	0	0
PENNSYLVANIA	46	23	18	8	16	0	3	0	2
PUERTO RICO	50	0	0	0	50	0	0	0	0
RHODE ISLAND	57	43	14	14	0	0	14	0	0
SOUTH CAROLINA	56	6	6	31	25	0	0	56	0
SOUTH DAKOTA	30	40	30	20	20	0	0	0	0
TENNESSEE	37	26	26	11	21	5	0	0	5
TEXAS	55	24	14	17	10	0	5	0	7
UTAH	50	17	0	17	0	0	0	0	0
VERMONT	25	38	13	0	25	0	0	0	0
VIRGINIA	33	27	0	13	27	0	0	0	0
WASHINGTON	39	46	15	0	0	0	0	0	0
WEST VIRGINIA	21	36	7	29	21	0	7	0	7
WISCONSIN	50	29	17	13	8	4	0	4	8
UNITED STATES	45%	24%	15%	12%	11%	3%	3%	0%	4%

*1. Willingness to have student teacher
2. Human relations skills
3. Knowledge of teaching methodology
4. Possession of bachelor's degree
5. Subject matter competency
6. Possession of master's degree
7. Possession of certificate for this kind kind of work
8. Course in supervision of s.t.
9. Other

TABLE 47. DEGREE OF SATISFACTION WITH COMPETENCY OF COOPERATING TEACHERS.

	Degree of Satisfaction				
	Almost Completely	Very Well	Quite Well	To Limited Extent	Not at All
ALABAMA	6%	41%	41%	12%	0%
ALASKA	50	0	50	0	0
ARIZONA	0	50	50	0	0
ARKANSAS	0	30	70	0	0
CALIFORNIA	8	47	37	5	0
COLORADO	0	64	36	0	0
CONNECTICUT	0	55	46	0	0
DIST. OF COL.	17	50	17	17	0
FLORIDA	0	46	46	8	0
GEORGIA	12	59	18	12	0
IDAHO	0	0	100	0	0
ILLINOIS	5	40	50	5	0
INDIANA	4	54	35	4	4
IOWA	12	54	31	4	0
KANSAS	0	33	61	6	0
KENTUCKY	7	47	40	7	0
LOUISIANA	14	57	0	0	0
MAINE	0	40	50	0	0
MARYLAND	19	44	31	6	0
MASSACHUSETTS	3	36	46	15	0
MICHIGAN	5	45	45	0	0
MINNESOTA	0	55	45	0	0
MISSISSIPPI	18	36	27	9	9
MISSOURI	15	25	45	15	0
MONTANA	0	33	67	0	0
NEBRASKA	7	36	57	0	0
NEW HAMPSHIRE	13	38	38	13	0
NEW JERSEY	13	67	13	7	0
NEW MEXICO	0	25	63	13	0
NEW YORK	14	25	48	10	0
NORTH CAROLINA	4	46	46	4	0
NORTH DAKOTA	0	13	75	13	0
OHIO	5	41	45	10	0
OKLAHOMA	31	46	15	8	0
OREGON	0	27	64	0	0
PENNSYLVANIA	12	39	43	5	0
PUERTO RICO	0	100	0	0	0
RHODE ISLAND	0	29	43	29	0
SOUTH CAROLINA	6	25	50	19	0
SOUTH DAKOTA	10	40	50	0	0
TENNESSEE	5	53	42	0	0
TEXAS	12	50	26	12	0
UTAH	0	67	33	0	0
VERMONT	0	25	75	0	0
VIRGINIA	0	73	20	7	0
WASHINGTON	0	62	39	0	0
WEST VIRGINIA	0	50	43	7	0
WISCONSIN	4	67	25	4	0
UNITED STATES	7%	44%	41%	7%	0%

well satisfied; 41% stated that they are quite well satisfied; 7% indicated that they are satisfied to a limited extent; and 2 respondents indicated that they are not satisfied at all with the competency of their cooperating teachers (however, these constitute less than one-half of one per cent and are therefore reported as 0% in table 47).

Table 48 deals with the payment to cooperating schools or cooperating teachers for working with student teachers. Table 48 shows that 24% of all respondents indicated that their institutions do not pay cooperating schools or cooperating teachers for working with their student teachers; 19% indicated that they make a payment to the school district (no effort was made in this study to determine what the school districts do with the money); 44% indicated that they make a payment directly to the cooperating teacher; and 12% checked the "other" category on this item. Most of these indicated that they use combinations or variations of those policies already mentioned.

Table 48 also shows that, of those institutions that do make a payment to cooperating schools or cooperating teachers, the mean amount of such payment is $58 for the entire country. A number of institutions reported that they pay a different amount to elementary or secondary cooperating teachers and also to public or private cooperating schools. Some respondents vary the payment according to the background of the cooperating teacher.

Table 49 shows other benefits provided for cooperating teachers. For instance, this table shows that 46% of the responding institutions grant their cooperating teachers college library privileges; 28% provide free consultant service from the college; 25% give their cooperating teachers some type of free tuition for college courses (a considerable number of private institutions provide such a tuition grant rather than make a cash payment to cooperating teachers); 18% provide their cooperating teachers with free tickets to concerts; 13% list the names of their cooperating teachers in the college catelog; 12% provide free tickets to athletic events for their cooperating teachers; 11% provide their cooperating teachers with some type of college faculty status; and 13% listed "other" benefits that they provide. The most frequently mentioned of these, in order, are: providing a dinner for cooperating teachers; having an appreciation tea; and sending a letter of appreciation to the cooperating teacher. Other interesting benefits mentioned includes: invitations to department of education programs, parking permits, use of college golf course, free tuition for adult education program, free course in the supervision of student teaching, use of college audio-visual equipment, certificate of associate in teacher education, use of campus instructional materials center, and the holding of a cocktail party.

Table 50 shows the mean per cent of institutions that pay building principals for the placement of student teachers in their building and also the mean amount of such payments. For the entire country, 7% of the responding institutions make such payments and the mean amount of these payments is $19.00 per student teacher.

TABLE 48. POLICY CONCERNING PAYMENT TO COOPERATING SCHOOLS OR COOPERATING TEACHERS AND AMOUNT OF SUCH PAYMENT.

	Policy Concerning Payment*				Amount
	1	2	3	4	
ALABAMA	35%	6%	47%	6%	$ 45
ALASKA	0	50	50	0	50
ARIZONA	0	0	50	50	33
ARKANSAS	20	0	80	0	29
CALIFORNIA	16	58	21	5	34
COLORADO	9	46	27	18	65
CONNECTICUT	46	0	46	9	87
DIST. OF COL.	83	0	0	17	105
FLORIDA	62	0	8	31	46
GEORGIA	6	12	24	59	45
IDAHO	0	0	100	0	50
ILLINOIS	30	20	33	15	63
INDIANA	8	0	89	4	75
IOWA	0	73	15	12	42
KANSAS	0	78	22	0	34
KENTUCKY	7	7	80	7	86
LOUISIANA	0	0	100	0	142
MAINE	0	0	90	10	63
MARYLAND	0	19	56	25	72
MASSACHUSETTS	67	3	9	18	78
MICHIGAN	5	45	35	15	48
MINNESOTA	5	50	30	15	39
MISSISSIPPI	55	18	18	9	33
MISSOURI	30	15	45	10	64
MONTANA	0	33	50	17	91
NEBRASKA	43	21	29	7	34
NEW HAMPSHIRE	13	0	88	0	50
NEW JERSEY	7	7	80	7	47
NEW MEXICO	0	0	100	0	69
NEW YORK	61	2	3	32	85
NORTH CAROLINA	29	11	57	4	36
NORTH DAKOTA	0	75	25	0	72
OHIO	14	12	69	5	58
OKLAHOMA	62	0	15	23	43
OREGON	0	18	55	27	34
PENNSYLVANIA	18	2	71	10	69
PUERTO RICO	0	0	50	50	150
RHODE ISLAND	0	0	86	14	93
SOUTH CAROLINA	25	13	44	19	39
SOUTH DAKOTA	10	60	30	0	47
TENNESSEE	21	32	21	26	37
TEXAS	57	24	10	7	48
UTAH	0	17	83	0	77
VERMONT	50	25	25	0	67
VIRGINIA	7	13	73	7	67
WASHINGTON	23	23	54	0	49
WEST VIRGINIA	0	7	86	7	68
WISCONSIN	17	13	67	4	69
UNITED STATES	24%	19%	44%	12%	$ 58

*1. Do not pay for this service
2. Make payment to school system
3. Make payment directly to cooperating teacher
4. Other

TABLE 49. BENEFITS PROVIDED FOR COOPERATING TEACHERS.

	Benefits Provided*							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
ALABAMA	59%	53%	18%	12%	24%	18%	18%	6%
ALASKA	50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
ARIZONA	0	0	50	0	0	0	0	0
ARKANSAS	60	20	10	20	10	20	20	0
CALIFORNIA	53	21	18	18	8	13	18	21
COLORADO	9	9	9	0	0	0	0	9
CONNECTICUT	27	27	36	9	36	9	27	0
DIST. OF COL.	33	17	67	0	17	0	17	0
FLORIDA	39	15	85	15	8	0	0	23
GEORGIA	71	41	29	24	35	12	29	18
IDAHO	67	33	33	33	0	67	0	33
ILLINOIS	58	20	28	35	15	33	15	18
INDIANA	73	39	8	23	23	15	8	15
IOWA	58	39	8	23	4	23	4	12
KANSAS	22	11	6	17	0	17	0	0
KENTUCKY	47	67	33	7	13	0	13	0
LOUISIANA	86	50	21	7	43	0	43	7
MAINE	40	20	10	10	20	0	30	20
MARYLAND	25	25	6	19	13	25	13	63
MASSACHUSETTS	46	39	70	12	12	3	9	15
MICHIGAN	80	45	5	30	10	15	10	5
MINNESOTA	15	5	5	5	0	10	0	20
MISSISSIPPI	19	55	27	0	0	0	0	9
MISSOURI	35	25	20	25	5	15	5	20
MONTANA	33	33	0	33	0	33	0	0
NEBRASKA	43	29	57	43	7	36	14	14
NEW HAMPSHIRE	38	0	38	13	25	0	13	38
NEW JERSEY	40	27	7	27	7	7	7	20
NEW MEXICO	38	50	13	25	0	0	13	0
NEW YORK	46	19	75	19	14	7	20	10
NORTH CAROLINA	25	29	18	4	7	7	4	7
NORTH DAKOTA	25	0	25	13	37	13	13	0
OHIO	41	17	29	7	10	5	7	14
OKLAHOMA	29	15	46	39	8	39	0	23
OREGON	54	55	36	36	46	18	18	27
PENNSYLVANIA	46	28	8	23	12	10	12	21
PUERTO RICO	50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
RHODE ISLAND	0	0	0	0	57	0	29	14
SOUTH CAROLINA	50	44	6	6	0	6	0	19
SOUTH DAKOTA	50	30	0	20	0	10	10	10
TENNESSEE	21	37	5	16	5	11	5	11
TEXAS	57	36	19	21	7	12	5	7
UTAH	33	0	0	0	0	17	17	33
VERMONT	38	50	50	0	25	0	38	13
VIRGINIA	53	0	0	7	27	0	0	7
WASHINGTON	39	15	31	0	0	8	0	8
WEST VIRGINIA	36	50	7	21	21	14	7	0
WISCONSIN	75	42	29	29	17	21	17	29
UNITED STATES	46%	28%	25%	18%	13%	12%	11%	13%

*1. Library privileges
2. Consultant service
3. Some free tuition
4. Concert tickets
5. Name in college catelog
6. Athletic tickets
7. College faculty status
8. Other

TABLE 50. PAYMENT TO BUILDING PRINCIPALS FOR PLACEMENT OF STUDENT TEACHERS IN THEIR BUILDINGS.

	Make Payment to Principals	Mean Amount of Payment
ALABAMA	35%	$ 13
ALASKA	0	0
ARIZONA	0	0
ARKANSAS	0	0
CALIFORNIA	3	0
COLORADO	0	0
CONNECTICUT	0	0
DIST. OF COL.	0	0
FLORIDA	0	0
GEORGIA	0	0
IDAHO	0	0
ILLINOIS	0	0
INDIANA	4	5
IOWA	0	0
KANSAS	0	0
KENTUCKY	27	22
LOUISIANA	36	47
MAINE	10	5
MARYLAND	0	0
MASSACHUSETTS	0	0
MICHIGAN	5	7
MINNESOTA	0	0
MISSISSIPPI	0	0
MISSOURI	0	0
MONTANA	33	45
NEBRASKA	0	0
NEW HAMPSHIRE	0	0
NEW JERSEY	7	0
NEW MEXICO	0	0
NEW YORK	2	0
NORTH CAROLINA	0	0
NORTH DAKOTA	0	0
OHIO	5	8
OKLAHOMA	0	0
OREGON	0	0
PENNSYLVANIA	2	0
PUERTO RICO	100	0
RHODE ISLAND	0	0
SOUTH CAROLINA	6	20
SOUTH DAKOTA	60	9
TENNESSEE	5	2
TEXAS	5	25
UTAH	17	0
VERMONT	25	63
VIRGINIA	13	5
WASHINGTON	77	8
WEST VIRGINIA	43	21
WISCONSIN	25	17
UNITED STATES	7%	$ 19

Table 51 deals with the use of a graduate course in the supervision of student teaching. This table shows that 27% of the respondents reported that they do offer such a course. Furthermore, table 51 indicates that the mean number enrolling in this course is 46 per year. This means that approximately 8,500 teachers enroll in such a course each year at the institutions that responded to this survey. If one could assume that the nonresponding institutions offer this course in the same proportion that responding schools do, then evidently a grand total of approximately 11,200 teachers enroll in such a course each year.

Lastly, table 51 shows that for the entire country, 15% of the respondents estimate that none of their cooperating teachers have taken such a course; 30% estimate that from 1 to 5% of their cooperating teachers have taken such a course; 14% estimate that from 6 to 10% of their cooperating teachers have taken such a course; 10% estimate from 11 to 25%; 10% estimate from 26 to 50%; 5% estimate from 51 to 75%; and 2% estimate that from 76 to 100% of their cooperating teachers have taken such a course in the supervision of student teaching.

AN ANALYSIS BY VARIABLE

An attempt has been made in this survey to determine whether or not there are any significant differences in the student teaching programs found in institutions that differ by nature of control (public or private), and by accreditation (NCATE accredited or not). The results of this analysis by these two variables is reported in this section.

Nature of Control. As was pointed out in table 1 at the beginning of this report, a total of 299 public and 544 private institutions participated in this survey. The differences between the way in which public and private institutions answered each item on the questionnaire were analyzed by using either the chi square technique or a simple analysis of variance. Table 52 shows the items on the questionnaire (see appendix) which were answered significantly different by public and private institutions.

Table 52 shows that the following differences between public and private institutions were found to be significant at the .01 level:

1. Public institutions have larger total enrollments.

2. Public institutions have larger full-time undergraduate enrollments.

3. Public institutions have greater percentagesof full-time undergraduate students.

TABLE 51. GRADUATE COURSE IN THE SUPERVISION OF STUDENT TEACHING.

	Have Such Course	Mean No. Enrolled Per Year	Mean Per Cent of Coop. Teachers Who Have Had Such A Course						
			0%	1-5%	6-10%	11-25%	26-50%	51-75%	76-100%
ALABAMA	35%	68	12%	47%	12%	6%	18%	0%	0%
ALASKA	50	0	0	50	50	0	0	0	0
ARIZONA	50	50	0	100	0	0	0	0	0
ARKANSAS	20	0	20	40	30	10	0	0	0
CALIFORNIA	26	20	21	18	16	11	13	0	0
COLORADO	55	166	0	0	9	18	55	0	0
CONNECTICUT	18	35	18	27	9	9	0	0	9
DIST. OF COL.	33	22	0	50	0	0	0	17	17
FLORIDA	39	50	23	0	8	23	31	8	0
GEORGIA	35	26	0	18	6	12	41	18	0
IDAHO	33	25	33	67	0	0	0	0	0
ILLINOIS	20	51	20	43	13	8	3	5	0
INDIANA	31	25	0	27	19	15	15	8	0
IOWA	12	35	19	31	19	8	0	0	4
KANSAS	33	28	0	33	22	11	17	0	0
KENTUCKY	53	45	0	0	0	13	27	40	20
LOUISIANA	71	43	0	14	7	14	14	21	29
MAINE	40	29	10	40	20	0	20	10	0
MARYLAND	13	178	31	19	25	6	6	6	6
MASSACHUSETTS	9	12	24	27	12	6	6	3	0
MICHIGAN	35	83	5	10	15	15	35	10	0
MINNESOTA	25	115	0	10	35	10	25	5	0
MISSISSIPPI	55	34	0	27	27	27	9	0	0
MISSOURI	10	50	30	55	0	0	0	0	0
MONTANA	50	24	17	33	0	0	0	17	0
NEBRASKA	36	59	7	21	7	29	14	21	0
NEW HAMPSHIRE	38	50	13	38	13	0	0	0	13
NEW JERSEY	0	0	20	40	0	0	7	0	0
NEW MEXICO	38	43	50	13	0	0	25	0	0
NEW YORK	31	40	5	36	14	10	3	0	0
NORTH CAROLINA	29	27	11	32	18	25	7	0	0
NORTH DAKOTA	50	42	13	25	13	0	0	50	0
OHIO	17	67	21	26	21	7	7	0	0
OKLAHOMA	23	33	8	62	8	8	0	0	0
OREGON	46	34	0	18	18	9	27	18	0
PENNSYLVANIA	13	39	18	41	10	7	2	2	0
PUERTO RICO	0	0	50	50	0	0	0	0	0
RHODE ISLAND	71	39	0	0	0	0	0	29	71
SOUTH CAROLINA	13	39	25	44	13	6	0	0	0
SOUTH DAKOTA	30	23	30	10	40	20	0	0	0
TENNESSEE	32	46	26	11	16	16	16	0	0
TEXAS	12	25	62	45	10	7	2	0	2
UTAH	67	38	0	17	17	50	0	0	0
VERMONT	0	0	25	50	13	0	0	0	0
VIRGINIA	13	37	7	47	20	0	7	7	7
WASHINGTON	62	66	0	15	31	23	15	8	0
WEST VIRGINIA	29	22	0	36	43	7	7	0	0
WISCONSIN	33	32	8	29	13	13	17	0	4
UNITED STATES	27%	46	15%	30%	14%	10%	10%	5%	2%

TABLE 52. SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES BETWEEN PUBLIC AND PRIVATE INSTITUTIONS.

	Questionnaire Item Numbers Answered Significantly Different	
	.01 level of significance	.05 level of significance
Obtained by Chi Square	2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10 11 (Elem.: Full-Part), 11 (Sec.: Full-Part), 12, 13 (Eng. prof.), 13 (Speech and voice), 13 (Emot. stab.), 14, 15, 16, 18, 19, 20, 21, 24, 25, 26, 30, 32, 37, 38, 39, 43, 46, 48, 50, 51 (video-tape equip.), 51 (Micro-Teaching), 51 (Flanders), 52, 54, 55 (Sup. of s.t. course), 55 (Workshops), 55 (Conferences), 55 (State conf.), 55 (Nat. conf.), 60 (Fac. status), 60 (Concerts), 61 (Yes-No), 62 (Yes-No), 63	9, 13 (Hearing), 13 (Per.-Soc.-Eth. fitness), 13 (other), 22, 23, 28, 29, 34, 51 (tape recorders), 58,
Obtained by Analysis of Variance	11 (Elem.: hrs./day), 11 (Elem.: qt. credits), 11 (Elem.: clock hrs.), 11 (Sec.: hrs./day), 11 (Sec.: qt. credits), 11 (Sec.: sem. credits), 19 (total budget), 27 (each cell), 50 (Elem.), 50 (Sec.), 50 (total), 59, 62 (No.),	20 (cost/s.t.), 21 (amt./s.t.), 61 (amt.)

4. More of the public institutions have received regional accreditation and NCATE accreditation.

5. More public schools prepare both elementary and secondary teachers.

6. More of the public schools have a Director of Student Teaching.

7. At public schools, the person in charge of student teaching devotes a greater percentage of his total time to administering the student teaching program.

8. More of the public institutions have full-time elementary student teaching.

9. More of the public schools have full-time secondary student teaching.

10. More of the public schools place their student teachers in public schools only.

11. More of the public schools include a check on English proficiency as a requirement for admission to student teaching.

12. More of the public schools check speech and voice as a requirement for admission to student teaching.

13. More of the private schools include a check on emotional stability as a requirement for admission to student teaching.

14. Public schools deny a greater percentage of applicants admission to student teaching.

15. More of the public schools have summer student teaching and more public schools have summer student teaching for experienced teachers only.

16. More of the private institutions pay the cost of student transportation during student teaching.

17. More of the public schools could supply information on the amount of the total student teaching budget and cost per student teacher.

18. More of the private school assess a special student teaching fee upon student teachers.

19. More of the public schools have a campus laboratory school.

20. More of the private schools do not use their campus laboratory schools for student teaching, participation, or observation.

21. More of the public schools have internship programs.

22. More of the public schools use graduate students to supervise student teachers.

23. College supervisors of public institutions visit their student teachers more frequently.

24. Public institutions have a greater number of student teachers--both during the academic year and during the summer.

25. More of the public institutions use Pass or Fail, or Satisfactory or Unsatisfactory, as grades for student teaching.

26. More of the private schools never place more than one student teacher in a given classroom at the same time.

27. More of the private schools never fail a student teacher; and public schools fail more student teachers in their first student teaching assignment.

28. Public schools screen a higher percentage of student teachers out of teacher education as a result of student teacher failure.

29. More of the public schools utilize the student teaching center concept.

30. Public schools use video-tape equipment more extensively with student teachers.

31. Public schools use micro-teaching more extensively.

32. Public schools use the Flander's interaction analysis technique more extensively.

33. More public institutions have written contracts with the schools in which they place student teachers.

34. Public schools use more cooperating teachers per year.

35. More of the public schools offer a formal course in the supervision of student teaching.

36. More of the public schools hold workshops for cooperating teachers.

37. More of the public schools hold larger conferences on student teaching.

38. More of the public institutions send cooperating teachers to state and national meetings dealing with student teaching.

39. More of the public institutions give some type of college faculty status to cooperating teachers.

40. More of the private schools give cooperating teachers concert tickets.

41. More of the public schools pay principals for the placement of student teachers in their building.

42. Public schools have a higher percentage of cooperating teachers who have had a course in the supervision of student teaching.

43. Elementary student teachers at public schools devote more hours per day to student teaching.

44. Of institutions that are on a quarter system, public institutions give more quarter credits for elementary student teaching.

45. Student teachers at public institutions devote more total clock hours to student teaching.

46. Secondary student teachers at public institutions devote more hours per day to student teaching.

47. Of institutions that are on a quarter system, public institutions give more quarter credits for secondary student teaching.

48. Of institutions on a semester system, public institutions give more semester credits for student teaching.

49. Public institutions have larger total student teaching budgets.

50. Public institutions have greater numbers of part-time and full-time elementary and secondary college supervisors.

51. Public institutions have a greater number of elementary student teaching centers and secondary student teaching centers.

52. Public institutions pay a greater amount of money to cooperating schools or cooperating teachers for working with their student teachers.

53. public institutions have a greater number of students enroll in a course in the supervision of student teaching each year.

Table 52 also shows that the following differences between public and private institutions were found to be significant at the .05 level:

1. The people in charge of student teaching at private colleges have been in that position longer than have their counterparts at public schools.
2. More of the public schools include a check on hearing as a requirement for admission to student teaching.
3. Private schools more often check on the students' personal-social-ethical fitness as a requirement for admission to student teaching.
4. More of the public schools have what they consider to be innovations in their student teaching programs.
5. More of the public institutions have received student teaching research grants during the past two years.
6. Public schools more often use college supervisors from academic areas.
7. College supervisors have more formal education at the public institutions.
8. Private institutions recommend a lower desirable full-time college supervisor load.
9. Public schools use tape recorders more extensively with student teachers.
10. Public schools more often make a payment to cooperating schools or cooperating teachers for working with student teachers.
11. The cost per student teacher of operating the student teaching program is greater at public institutions.
12. Of institutions assessing such a fee, private institutions assess a higher special student teaching fee upon the student teacher.
13. Of institutions that pay principals for the placement of student teachers in their buildings, public institutions pay a greater amount.

NCATE Accreditation. An effort was also made to determine if institutions that have received accreditation from the National Council of Accreditation for Teacher Education answered the items on the questionnaire significantly different than institutions that have not received this accreditation. This was done by using the chi square technique or a simple analysis of variance. Table 53 shows the item numbers on the questionnaire (see appendix) which were answered significantly different by institutions which have received NCATE accreditation and institutions which have not received such accreditation.

Table 53 shows that the following differences between NCATE and non-NCATE institutions were found to be significant at the .01 level:

1. More of the NCATE schools are public institutions.
2. NCATE schools have larger total enrollments.
3. NCATE schools have larger full-time undergraduate enrollments.
4. NCATE schools have a higher percentage of full-time undergraduates preparing to be teachers.
5. More of the NCATE schools have received regional accreditation.
6. More of the NCATE schools prepare both elementary and secondary teachers.
7. More of the NCATE schools have a Director of Student Teaching or Coordinator of Laboratory Experiences.
8. The people in charge of student teaching at the non-NCATE schools have been in that position longer than their counterparts in NCATE schools.
9. The people in charge of student teaching at NCATE institutions devote more of their total time to this task.
10. NCATE schools more often have full-time elementary student teaching.
11. NCATE schools more often have full-time secondary student teaching.
12. Non-NCATE schools more often place student teachers in private schools.
13. NCATE schools more often include a check on overall academic record as a requirement for admission to student teaching.

TABLE 53. SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES BETWEEN NCATE AND NON-NCATE INSTITUTIONS.

	Questionnaire Item Numbers Answered Significantly Different	
	.01 level of significance	.05 level of significance
Obtained by Chi Square	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11 (Elem.: Full-Part), 11 (Sec.: Full-Part), 12, 13 (Overall Acad.), 13 (Speech-Voice), 14, 15, 16 19, 21, 22, 24, 25, 26, 29, 30, 37, 38, 39, 43, 46, 48, 50 (Yes-No), 51 (Video-tapes), 51 (Micro-Teaching), 51 (Flanders), 52, 54, 55 (Sup. of S.T. course), 55 (Workshop), 55 (Conferences), 60 (Free Tuition), 61 (Yes-No), 62 (Yes-No), 63	11 (Elem.: On-Off), 13 (Rec. Major), 13 (Hearing), 17, 20, 23, 34, 51 (Sensitivity Training), 57, 60 (Fac. status), 60 (Concerts),
Obtained by Analysis of Variance	11 (Elem.: hrs./day), 11 (Elem.: qt. credits), 11 (Elem.: sem. credits), 11 (Elem.: total hrs.), 11 (Sec.: hrs./day), 11 (Sec.: qt. credits), 11 (Sec.: sem. credits), 19 (Amt.), 19 (amt.), 27 (each cell), 50 (Elem., Sec., Total), 59 (amt.), 62 (no.)	11 (Elem.: days/wk.), 11 (Sec.: days/wk.),

14. NCATE schools more often include a check on speech and voice as a requirement for admission to student teaching.

15. NCATE schools deny admission to student teaching to a higher percentage of applicants.

16. More of the NCATE schools operate summer student teaching programs.

17. NCATE schools more often operate summer student teaching programs for experienced teachers only.

18. NCATE schools can more often provide information about the total cost of the student teaching program.

19. Non-NCATE schools more often assess a special student teaching fee upon the student teachers.

20. NCATE schools more often have what they consider to be innovations in their student teaching programs.

21. NCATE schools more often have campus laboratory schools.

22. Non-NCATE schools more often do not use their campus laboratory schools for student teaching, participation, or observation.

23. NCATE schools more often operate internship programs.

24. College supervisors at NCATE schools have more formal education.

25. NCATE schools more often employ graduate students to supervise student teachers.

26. NCATE schools have larger numbers of student teachers during the academic year and during the summer session.

27. NCATE schools more often use a Pass-Fail, or Satisfactory-Unsatisfactory grading system for student teaching.

28. Non-NCATE schools more often never place more than one student teacher in a given classroom at the same time.

29. More of the non-NCATE schools never fail student teaching.

30. NCATE schools screen a higher percentage of students out of teacher education at the student teaching level.

31. NCATE schools more often utilize the student teaching center concept.

32. NCATE schools use video-tape equipment more extensively with student teachers.

33. NCATE schools use micro-teaching more extensively.

34. NCATE schools use Flander's interaction analysis material more extensively during student teaching.

35. More of the NCATE institutions have written contracts with the schools in which they place student teachers.

36. NCATE schools work with a higher number of cooperating teachers.

37. NCATE schools more often offer a formal course in the supervision of student teaching.

38. NCATE schools more often hold workshops for cooperating teachers.

39. NCATE schools more often hold larger conferences on student teaching.

40. NCATE schools more often provide cooperating teachers with free tuition for college courses.

41. NCATE schools more often pay building principals for the placement of student teachers in their buildings.

42. A higher percentage of cooperating teachers of NCATE institutions have had a course in the supervision of student teaching.

43. Elementary student teachers at NCATE schools devote more hours per day to student teaching.

44. NCATE institutions grant more quarter credits and semester credits for elementary student teaching.

45. Elementary student teachers at NCATE institutions devote more total clock hours to student teaching.

46. Secondary student teachers at NCATE schools devote more hours per day to student teaching.

47. NCATE schools give more quarter credits and more semester credits for student teaching.

48. NCATE institutions have a greater student teaching budget.

49. The cost of the student teaching program per student teacher is greater at NCATE schools.

50. NCATE schools have greater numbers of part-time, full-time, elementary, and secondary college supervisors.

51. NCATE schools have a greater number of elementary and secondary student teaching centers.

52. NCATE institutions pay a greater amount to cooperating schools or cooperating teachers for working with their student teachers.

53. NCATE schools have a greater number of students enroll each year in a course dealing with the supervision of student teaching.

Table 53 also shows that the following differences between NCATE and non-NCATE institutions were found to be significant at the .05 level:

1. NCATE schools more often have on-campus elementary student teaching.

2. NCATE schools more often include a check on record in major field as a requirement for admission to student teaching.

3. NCATE schools more often include a check on hearing as a requirement for admission to student teaching.

4. More of the NCATE schools have had law suits growing out of some aspect of student teaching.

5. More of the NCATE schools could provide information about the cost per student teacher of operating the student teaching program.

6. More of the NCATE schools have received student teaching grants during the past two years.

7. Non-NCATE schools recommend a lighter desirable college supervisor load.

8. Non-NCATE schools use sensitivity training for student teachers more extensively.

9. Non-NCATE schools are more satisfied with the competencies of their cooperating teachers.

10. NCATE schools more often provide cooperating teachers with some type of college faculty status.

11. Non-NCATE schools more often provide cooperating teachers with concert tickets.

12. Elementary student teachers at NCATE schools devote more days per week to student teaching.

13. Secondary student teachers at NCATE schools devote more days per week to student teaching.

It is obvious, from the length of these lists of differences, that there are a great many basic and significant differences between the student teaching programs found in public institutions and those found in private schools; and also between the student teaching programs of institutions that have received NCATE accreditation and those that have not received this accreditation. It is also obvious that the nature of these differences strongly suggest that public institutions as a group have superior student teaching programs when compared to non-NCATE schools as a group. There are many notable exceptions to this generalization when one looks at individual institutions.

It should also be noted that some of the differences between the student teaching programs of public and of private schools suggest that, regarding certain points, the private schools seem to have the stronger student teaching programs. By the same token, regarding the differences between the student teaching programs of NCATE and non-NCATE schools, on certain points, the non-NCATE schools seem to have the stronger programs. However, the vast majority of the differences strongly suggest that public schools as a group have superior student teaching programs and that NCATE schools as a group have superior student teaching programs.

ERRATA

The first complete paragraph on page 83 should read as follows:

It is obvious, from the length of these lists of differences, that there are a great many basic and significant differences between the student teaching programs found in public institutions and those found in private schools; and also between the student teaching programs of institutions that have received NCATE accreditation and those that have not received this accreditation. It is also obvious that the nature of these differences strongly suggest that public institutions as a group have superior student teaching programs when compared to private institutions as a group; and that NCATE schools as a group have superior student teaching programs when compared to non-NCATE schools as a group. There are many notable exceptions to this generalization when one looks at individual institutions.

AN ANALYSIS OF NONRESPONDENCE

An attempt was also made in this survey to determine whether or not the student teaching programs of the responding institutions are basically the same as those of the nonresponding institutions. In an effort to do this, a random sample of 10% of the nonresponding institutions was visited by the project director. Of the 26 institutions that were visited throughout the United States, rather complete information was obtained from 23 schools.

The analysis of nonrespondence consisted of comparing the information gathered from the personal visit to these 23 institutions (which, due to their random selection, will be considered representative of the nonresponding schools) with the information gathered through the mail from the 847 responding institutions.

Space does not permit reporting the comparison between the way responding and nonresponding institutions answered all items on the questionnaire; therefore, only those items which were answered quite differently by these two groups will be mentioned in this final report.

While 36% of the responding institutions are public institutions, only 20% of the visited schools are public. A total of 93% of the responding schools have received regional accreditation while 83% of the visited schools have been accredited by their respective regional accrediting agencies. Also, while 48% of all responding institutions have received NCATE accreditation, only 30% of the visited random sample of nonresponding institutions have been accredited by NCATE.

A total of 52% of the visited institutions have a director of student teaching whereas only 38% of the responding institutions have someone with that title on the faculty. The person in charge of the student teaching program at 8% of the visited schools has been in that position for less than one year whereas 17% of the people in charge of student teaching at the responding schools have been in that position for less than one year. Also, while 50% of the responding institutions reported that the person in charge of student teaching devoted 50% or less of his total time to administering the student teaching program, only 29% of the visited institutions reported the same situation.

Thirteen per cent of the random sample of visited nonresponding institutions had a campus laboratory school while 23% of the responding institutions had such a school.

Twenty-two per cent of the responding institutions reported that they conduct some type of internship program; however, none of the visited institutions operate any internship programs.

Ninety-two per cent of the visited institutions reported that their student teachers can have some voice in selecting the school to which they will be assigned for student teaching, while 72% of the responding institutions reported the same situation.

Finally, only 8% of the visited institutions indicated that they offer a graduate course in the supervision of student teaching, compared to 27% of the responding institutions.

These 10 questions are those which the responding and the visited random sample of nonresponding institutions answered quite differently. These 10 questions constitute a very small proportion of the total questionnaire. Furthermore, an analysis of the differences in the way the two groups answered these questions does not suggest that one group might tend to have better student teaching programs than the other group. In view of these facts, it is concluded that the student teaching programs of the responding and nonresponding institutions tend to be basically the same. It is further concluded that one is therefore justified in generalizing the results of this survey to all teacher preparing institutions in the United States.

CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

One of the first conclusions that one must draw from the results of this survey is that there is great diversion among the student teaching programs in the United States. For example, the size of student teaching programs vary greatly from those with fewer than 25 student teachers to those with over 2,000 student teachers per year. Other examples of this diversity among student teaching programs include the following: some schools have a full-time director of student teaching who devotes all of his time to administering the student teaching program whereas, in at least one instance, this task is performed by a Dean of the Graduate School; student teaching assignments range from 6 weeks at some schools to 18 weeks at others; total clock hours spent in student teaching range from 180 hours to over 500 hours; payments to cooperating teachers range from nothing to several hundred dollars per student teacher; some institutions would not think of having graduate students supervise student teachers whereas at other institutions over 90% of the supervision is done by graduate students. This list of diversities among student teaching programs could go on and on as shown by the data presented earlier in this report. Some of this diversity is undoubtedly undesirable due to the fact that it is brought about in part by the fact that some schools have a very minimal student teaching program. On the other hand, much of this diversity is a healthy sign that a good deal of innovating and change is taking place in student teaching programs throughout the country.

A second conclusion that seems to evolve from this survey is that the excellence of a student teaching program can be judged only in relation to the total teacher education program at that institution. For instance, it is somewhat generally felt that approximately sixteen student teachers is a fairly desirable load for a full-time college supervisor. However, as was highlighted by individual questionnaires received in this survey, sixteen student teachers may be a very heavy load if the college supervisor has to do a great deal of traveling to see all of them. On the other hand, sixteen student teachers may be a light load if all of them are placed near the campus. Likewise, the total number of clock hours spent in student teaching may be a misleading measure of the excellence of a student teaching program unless one knows the extent to which students at that school are involved in pre student teaching laboratory experiences. Also, the per cent of student teacher failure can be a misleading figure unless one knows what screening has taken place prior to student teaching. One must remember that what constitutes excellence in student teaching will vary from one institution to another.

Yet another conclusion that can be drawn from this survey is that the danger of law suits growing out of student teaching is apparently very slight. The people in charge of the 847 student teaching programs that are included in this survey knew of only twelve such law suits in the history of these institutions.

Another encouraging conclusion that can be made from this survey is that there is a good deal of innovating being done in student teaching programs today. To be more specific, 45% of all responding institutions indicated that they have what they consider to be innovations in their student teaching programs.

A much less encouraging conclusion of this survey is that student teaching programs in the United States have received very few research grants during the past two years. In fact, only 40 schools reported receiving any student teaching research grants over the last two years. Furthermore, many of the research grants that were reported touch student teaching only tangentially.

This survey also revealed that a very small proportion of the student teachers in the United States are being supervised by graduate assistants. Only 9% of the responding institutions reported using graduate assistants for this purpose, and the mean per cent of the total supervision done by graduate assistants in these 76 institutions is 31%.

Another conclusion that can be drawn from this study is that the people in charge of student teaching programs believe the load of college supervisors is heavier than it should be. Table 22 revealed that, for all responding institutions, the mean number of student teachers assigned to each full-time college supervisor was 1-5 at 4% of the institutions;

6-10 at 17% of the institutions; 11-15 at 21% of the institutions; 16-20 at 28% of the schools; 21-25 at 14% of the institutions; 26-30 at 8% of the schools; 31-35 at 4% of the schools; 36-40 at 1% of the schools; and 40+ at 1% of the institutions. Table 22 shows the recommended load of full-time college supervisors based on the opinions of the people in charge of the 847 student teaching programs included in this survey. This table shows that 12% of the respondents recommended a load of fewer than 10 student teachers; 14% recommended a load of 10 or 11 student teachers; 8% recommended 12 or 13 student teachers; 22% recommended 14 or 15 student teachers; 9% recommended 16 or 17 student teachers; 13% recommended 18 or 19 student teachers; 17% recommended 20 to 25 student teachers; 3% recommended 26 to 30 student teachers; and 2 institutions recommended that each college supervisor should have more than 30 student teachers. This discrepancy between what college supervisor loads actually are and what people in charge of student teaching programs recommended they should be points up the justification for this conclusion.

It can also be concluded from this survey that the preponderance of institutions still use the traditional letter grade in student teaching--82% to be exact. Six per cent use pass-fail, 8% use satisfactory-unsatisfactory, and 4% use some other grading system. If one takes the position that a pass-fail or satisfactory-unsatisfactory grading system is preferable for student teaching (and many people in student teaching work do--at least at the verbal level) then this conclusion is not an encouraging one.

One of the very most encouraging conclusions of this survey relates to the provision of opportunity for student teaching in disadvantaged areas. Seventy-five per cent of all respondents indicated that they did provide this opportunity for their student teachers. Those who are concerned about the recruitment of teachers for the disadvantaged areas will rejoice at this conclusion.

Yet another conclusion that is justified on the basis of this survey is that a very tiny percentage of students are screened out of teacher education at the student teaching level. Twenty-three per cent of the respondents indicated that they never fail a student teacher and thereby eliminate him or her from teacher education; 57% indicated that this happens to less than one per cent of their student teachers; 10% indicated this happens to 1% of their student teachers; 4% said they screen out less than 2% of their student teachers; 2% indicated this happens to 3% of their student teachers; and 1% of the institutions indicated that 4% of their student teachers fail and are thereby eliminated from teacher education.

One may also conclude on the basis of this survey that the most important characteristic for a college supervisor to possess is good human relations skills; the second most important characteristic is knowledge of teaching methodology; the third is a commitment to supervision; the fourth is subject matter competency; and the fifth is possession of a doctor's degree. This information is shown in table 25.

As pointed out so vividly in the section of this report entitled "An Analysis By Variable," one of the most inescapable conclusions based on the data generated by this survey is that there are very basic and significant differences between the student teaching programs found in public and those found in private institutions and also between institutions that have received NCATE accreditation and institutions that have not received this accreditation. No attempt will be made to restate in this section the data that supports this conclusion but rather, readers will be referred back to that section just mentioned. Perhaps it is necessary, however, to mention at this time that the nature of the differences found between these two variables strongly suggests that public institutions as a group have superior student teaching programs when compared to private institutions as a group and that, as a group, NCATE accredited institutions have superior student teaching programs when compared to the group of institutions that do not have such accreditation. One must hasten to add that there are notable exceptions to this generalization when one looks at individual institutions.

Lastly, in view of the fact that this survey is largely a discriptive study, perahps the most important conclusions that can be made from it are those that are implicit in the normative data contained in this report. Digesting this vast amount of data is a difficult task; however, the most valid conclusions of this study will be those made by each individual as he analyzes the data contained in the series of tables presented earlier in this report.

SUMMARY OF THE STUDY

This study was designed to collect rather comprehensive descriptive information on student teaching in the United States. With the help of seven consultants, a rather lengthy questionnaire was developed, revised, pretested, and finalized. This questionnaire was then sent to each teacher preparing institution in the United States. Ultimately, returns were received from 847 institutions. This constitutes 76% of the estimated 1110 teacher preparing institutions in the United States.

The information about the student teaching programs of these 847 institutions was transferred to IBM cards and was tallied and analyzed by electronic data processing equipment. This information was tallied for each state and also for the entire country. Also, an analysis was made between public and private institutions, and between institutions that have received NCATE accreditation and institutions that have not received NCATE accreditation.

A random sample of 10% of the schools that did not respond to the questionnaire were visited in an effort to determine if the student teaching programs of the nonresponding institutions are basically the same as the student teaching programs of the responding institutions. A comparison was made between the information gathered by interviewing the person in charge of student teaching at these visited schools and the information gathered through the questionnaire from the 847 responding schools. While there were some minor differences between these two groups, it was concluded that the student teaching programs of the nonresponding institutions are basically the same as the student teaching programs of the responding schools. Therefore, it has also been concluded that the results of this survey can be generalized to all student teaching programs in the United States; and that the student teaching picture painted by the data collected from the 847 responding institutions is a true picture of student teaching generally in this country.

The major findings of this study consist of a great deal of descriptive information about student teaching practices in the United States. Some of the items on the questionnaire, however, were designed to solicit the opinions and recommendations of the people who are in charge of student teaching, programs concerning ways to improve student teaching in this country.

Some of the major conclusions of this study are as follows:

1. There is great diversity among the student teaching programs in the United States.
2. Excellence in a student teaching program can be determined only in relationship to the total teacher education program and to the particular set of circumstances that exist at each institution.
3. Those in charge of student teaching programs recommend that college supervisors should have a lighter load than they currently do.
4. The vast majority of institutions still give the traditional letter grade (A, B, C, etc.) for student teaching.
5. Three-fourths of the institutions now provide opportunities for student teaching in disadvantaged areas.
6. Many institutions never fail a student teacher and even at those institutions that do so, a very tiny percentage of students are actually screened out of teacher education as a result of failing student teaching.
7. Those in charge of student teaching programs believe that the most important characteristics for a college supervisor to possess are, in order, good human relations skills, knowledge of teaching methodology, a commitment to supervision, and subject matter competency.
8. There are a great many basic and significant differences between the student teaching programs found in public institutions and those found in private institutions and also between institutions that have received NCATE accreditation and institutions that have

not received such accreditation. The nature of these differences suggest that public institutions as a group have superior student teaching programs when compared to private institutions as a group, and that NCATE institutions as a group have superior student teaching programs when compared to non-NCATE institutions as a group. Of course, there are many notable exceptions to this generalization when one views individual institutions.

9. Lastly, since this survey is largely a descriptive study, the most valid conclusions that will be drawn from it are those made by each individual as he analyzes for himself the descriptive data generated by the study.

APPENDIX

A NATIONAL SURVEY OF STUDENT TEACHING PROGRAMS

Conducted by: Dr. Jim Johnson
Associate Director of Student Teaching
Northern Illinois University
DeKalb, Illinois 60115

Supported by: United States Office of Education
Under the provisions of Public Law 531
and
Northern Illinois University

DIRECTIONS FOR COMPLETING THIS SURVEY INSTRUMENT:

The purpose of this instrument is to try to gather pertinent information about student teaching programs throughout the United States. We would appreciate having the person in charge of the student teaching program fill out this instrument. Please be as accurate as possible. Where you lack the specific information requested, feel free to use approximations. If you feel that an item does not adequately provide for the situation at your institution, please add explanatory notes in the margin. Please answer all items.

DEFINITION OF STUDENT TEACHING:

The definition of student teaching used in this study is as follows: "A period of guided teaching when a college student assumes increasing responsibility for directing the learning of a group or groups of learners over a period of consecutive weeks." For the purposes of this study, a distinction is made between "student teaching" and "internship" which is typically a paid graduate experience. It is not intended that this study include internships unless your institution uses the terms "student teaching" and "internship" synonymously.

NAME, TITLE, AND ADDRESS OF PERSON COMPLETING THIS INSTRUMENT:

NAME: ______________________

TITLE: ______________________

INSTITUTION: ______________________

ADDRESS: ______________________

____

____

If you do not have a student teaching program, please check here ☐ and return this material in the self-addressed, stamped envelope which ha been provided.

If you wish to receive a complimentary copy of the results of this survey, please check here ☐.

GENERAL BACKGROUND OF THE INSTITUTION

1. Is your school essentially a public or private institution?

☐ Public ☐ Private

2. What is the approximate total enrollment of your institution? (Please include undergraduate, graduate, full-time, and part-time students).

☐ 0 - 499 ☐ 3,000 - 4,999 ☐ 15,000 - 19,999
☐ 500 - 999 ☐ 5,000 - 9,999 ☐ 20,000 - 29,999
☐ 1,000 - 2,999 ☐ 10,000 - 14,999 ☐ 30,000 & above

3. Approximately how many **full-time undergraduate** students are enrolled at your institution?

☐ 0 - 499 ☐ 3,000 - 4,999 ☐ 15,000 - 19,999
☐ 500 - 999 ☐ 5,000 - 9,999 ☐ 20,000 - 29,999
☐ 1,000 - 2,999 ☐ 10,000 - 14,999 ☐ 30,000 & above

4. Approximately what percent of your full-time undergraduate students are preparing to be teachers?

☐ 0 - 25% ☐ 26 - 50% ☐ 51 - 75% ☐ 76 - 100%

5. Is your undergraduate program accredited by one of the regional accreditation associations (North Central, Middle States, New England, Northwest, Southern, Western)? ☐ Yes ☐ No

6. Is your undergraduate program accredited by the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE)?

☐ Yes ☐ No

7. Please check the type of teacher education program that your institution has at this time.

☐ Elementary only ☐ Secondary only
☐ Both elementary and secondary

ADMINISTRATION OF THE STUDENT TEACHING PROGRAM

8. What is the title of the person who is directly in charge of your total student teaching program?

☐ Director of Student Teaching ☐ Head, Department of Education
☐ Coordinator of Laboratory Experiences ☐ Dean, College of Education
☐ Other, please state title: ______________________

____

9. How many years have you been in charge of the student teaching program?

☐ Less than 1 year ☐ 11-15 years
☐ 1-2 years ☐ 16-20 years
☐ 3-4 years ☐ More than 20 years
☐ 5-10 years

10. As the person in charge of student teaching, approximately what percent of your total time is actually devoted to administering the student teaching program (as opposed to supervising student teachers, teaching a class, other administrative duties, etc.)?

☐ 1 - 10% ☐ 26 - 50% ☐ 76 - 90%
☐ 11 - 25% ☐ 51 - 75% ☐ 91 - 100%

11. Please fill in the following chart to provide basic information about your student teaching program. If there are variations, please indicate the usual or predominate pattern.

	Where Done		Full or Part Time		Length			Number of Credits		Approximate total number of clock hours spent in student teaching
	On Campus	Off Campus	Full Time	Part Time	No. of Weeks	Days per Week	Hours per Day	Quarter Hours	Sem. Hrs.	
Elementary										
Secondary										

12. In what type of schools do you place your student teachers?

☐ Public schools only
☐ Both public and private schools
☐ Private schools only
☐ Campus laboratory school only
☐ Other, please explain: ____________________

13. Please check those items which you include as requirements for admission to student teaching.

☐ Overall academic record
☐ Physical fitness
☐ Record in professional ed. courses
☐ Recommendation by adviser
☐ Record in major field
☐ Emotional stability
☐ English proficiency
☐ Personal-social-ethical fitness
☐ Speech and voice
☐ Extra-class activity
☐ Hearing
☐ Other, please state: ____________________

14. Of the students who formally apply for a student teaching assignment, approximately what percent of the applicants are denied admission to student teaching?

☐ All applicants are admitted
☐ 5-6% are denied admission
☐ Less than 1% are denied admission
☐ 7-8% are denied admission
☐ 1-2% are denied admission
☐ 9-10% are denied admission
☐ 3-4% are denied admission
☐ More than 10% are denied admission

15. Please check the type of summer student teaching program that you conduct.

☐ No summer student teaching
☐ Summer student teaching for regular undergraduates only
☐ Summer student teaching for experienced teachers only
☐ Summer student teaching for both regular undergraduates and for experienced teachers
☐ Other, please explain: ____________________

16. Please check the most appropriate statement concerning summer student teaching at your institution.

☐ No summer student teaching
☐ Summer student teaching only in our campus laboratory school
☐ Summer student teaching only in surrounding school systems
☐ Summer student teaching both in our campus laboratory school and in surrounding school systems

17. To the best of your knowledge, has your student teaching program or have any of your student teachers ever been involved in a law suit growing out of any aspect of student teaching? ☐ Yes ☐ No

If yes, please briefly state circumstances and outcome: ____________________

18. Does your institution pay the cost of student transportation during student teaching? ☐ Yes ☐ No

If yes, please briefly explain: ____________________

19. What is the amount of your total student teaching budget?

☐ Do not have such information
Total budget $____________________

Briefly explain what costs are included in this budget ____________________

20. What is the approximate cost of operating your student teaching program per student teacher? ☐ Do not have such information

Approximate cost per student teacher $____________________

Please provide any explanation you feel may be necessary: ____________________

21. Is a special student teaching fee assessed by your institution upon the student teacher other than regular tuition charges?

☐ Yes ☐ No

If yes, how much is this fee per student teacher? $____________________

22. Do you have what you consider to be any innovations in your student teaching program? ☐ Yes ☐ No

If yes, briefly explain:

____

____

23. Have you received any research grants in your student teaching program during the past two years? ☐ Yes ☐ No

If yes: Amount of grant $______________

Source of grant ______________________

____

Title of research project ______________________

____

24. Does your institution have a campus laboratory school?
☐ Yes ☐ No

25. If you have a campus laboratory school, please check the statement which best describes its use in your student teaching program.

☐ We do **not** use the laboratory school for student teaching, participation, or observation

☐ We use the laboratory school for participation and observation purposes only

☐ Only one student teacher a year is placed in each room

☐ One student teacher is placed in a room each quarter or semester

☐ Two student teachers are placed in each room at the same time.

☐ Three student teachers are placed in each room at the same time

☐ Four student teachers are placed in each room at the same time

☐ Other, please explain: ______________________

____

____

26. Does your institution operate any internship programs?

☐ Yes ☐ No

If yes, very briefly explain the program(s): ______________________

____

____

____

____

27. Please fill in the following chart showing the number of college supervisors that you have.

	Full-time College Supervisors	Part-time College Supervisors	TOTALS
Elementary			
Secondary			
TOTALS			

GRAND TOTAL ↑

28. What type of college supervisors do you use in your secondary student teaching program?

☐ General college supervisors

☐ College supervisors from the academic areas

☐ A combination of the above

☐ Other, please explain: ______________________

____

29. Which statement best describes the degree status of your college supervisors in general?

☐ All of them have a doctors degree

☐ Most of them have a doctors degree

☐ Most of them have masters degree plus considerable additional credits

☐ Most of them have a masters degree as their highest degree

☐ Most of them have a bachelor's degree as their highest degree

30. Do you employ graduate students to supervise student teachers?

☐ Yes ☐ No

If yes, approximately what percent of your total student teaching supervision is done by graduate students rather than by regular faculty members? __________%

31. What is the **average** number of student teachers assigned to each full-time college supervisor (or the equivalent of a full-time college supervisor if you have part-time college supervisors) at any one time?

☐ 1 - 5
☐ 6 - 10
☐ 11 - 15
☐ 16 - 20
☐ 21 - 25
☐ 26 - 30
☐ 31 - 35
☐ 36 - 40
☐ More than 40

32. Please check the statement which best describes the general pattern of your college supervisors' visits to each student teacher.

- ☐ **Twice each week**
- ☐ **Once each week**
- ☐ **Once every two weeks**
- ☐ **Once every three weeks**
- ☐ **Once every month**
- ☐ **Once every two months**
- ☐ **Once each quarter**
- ☐ **Once each semester**
- ☐ **Never**

33. Briefly describe the procedure used for equating the load of a faculty member supervising student teachers to the load of a faculty member engaged in classroom teaching. Indicate any formula you might use in determining college supervisor load.

34. What do you believe would be the most desirable, yet practical, ratio of full-time college supervisors to student teachers?

- ☐ **1 to less than 10**
- ☐ **1 to 10-11**
- ☐ **1 to 12-13**
- ☐ **1 to 14-15**
- ☐ **1 to 16-17**
- ☐ **1 to 18-19**
- ☐ **1 to 20-25**
- ☐ **1 to 26-30**
- ☐ **1 to more than 30**

35. Rank (1,2,3,4, etc.) the following according to the most important characteristics that you look for in a college supervisor.

- ___ **Subject matter competency**
- ___ **Knowledge of teaching methodology**
- ___ **Human relations skills**
- ___ **Possession of a doctors degree**
- ___ **A commitment to supervision**
- ___ **Other, please explain:** ______________________

36. Do any of your college supervisors hold joint appointments in two departments? ☐ **Yes** ☐ **No**

If yes, please explain: ______________________

THE STUDENT TEACHERS THEMSELVES

37. How many student teachers did your institution have during th academic year 1966-67, not including the summer session?

- ☐ **Under 25**
- ☐ **25-49**
- ☐ **50-99**
- ☐ **100-299**
- ☐ **300-499**
- ☐ **500-699**
- ☐ **700-999**
- ☐ **1000-2000**
- ☐ **Over 2000**

38. How many student teachers did your institution have during the 1967 summer school session?

- ☐ **0**
- ☐ **1-10**
- ☐ **11-25**
- ☐ **26-50**
- ☐ **51-100**
- ☐ **101-150**
- ☐ **151-200**
- ☐ **201-300**
- ☐ **Over 300**

39. What type of grade do you use for student teaching?

- ☐ **Letter grade (A,B,C, etc.)**
- ☐ **Satisfactory or Unsatisfactory**
- ☐ **Other, please explain:** ______________________
- ☐ **Pass or Fail**

40. Please rank (1,2,3,4, etc.) according to importance, those who par ticipated in the evaluation of student teachers. Rank only those wh actually participate.

- ___ **Cooperating teacher**
- ___ **College supervisor**
- ___ **Principal of cooperating school**
- ___ **Other, please state:** ______________________
- ___ **Director of Student Teaching**

41. Can your student teachers choose the type of school to which th will be assigned for student teaching? ☐ **Yes** ☐ **No**

42. Do you provide opportunities for student teaching in disadvantage areas? ☐ **Yes** ☐ **No**

43. Do you place more than one student teacher in a given classroom the same time?

☐ **Never** ☐ **Rarely** ☐ **Quite often** ☐ **Always**

44. Do most of your student teachers have classroom observation experiences prior to student teaching? ☐ Yes ☐ No

45. During student teaching, on the average, approximately what percent of your student teachers' time is spent in:

observation? ______%
participation? ______%
actual teaching? ______%

46. Approximately what percent of your student teachers fail their first student teaching assignment?

- ☐ None
- ☐ Less than 1%
- ☐ 1%
- ☐ 2%
- ☐ 3%
- ☐ 4%
- ☐ 5%
- ☐ 6%
- ☐ Over 6%

47. What alternatives are available to a student who fails his or her first student teaching assignment?

- ☐ The student is eliminated from the teacher education program once and for all
- ☐ He is given a second student teaching assignment after meeting certain requirements
- ☐ He may appeal to a committee which determines if he may have a second student teachnig assignment
- ☐ Other, please explain: ______________________________

____

48. Approximately what percent of your student teachers fail student teaching and are thereby eliminated from the teacher education program?

- ☐ None
- ☐ Less than 1%
- ☐ 1%
- ☐ 2%
- ☐ 3%
- ☐ 4%
- ☐ 5%
- ☐ 6%
- ☐ Over 6%

49. Rank (1,2,3,4, etc.) according to importance the following causes of student teacher failure at your institution.

___ Inability to control students

___ Inability to get along with other teachers

___ Unwillingness to work

___ Poor subject matter background

___ Poor knowledge of teaching methodology

___ Other, please state: ______________________________

____

____

50. Do you utilize the student teaching center concept in your student teaching program? ☐ Yes ☐ No

If yes, how many elementary centers? __________

how many secondary centers? __________

how many total centers? __________

51. Please indicate the extent to which you utilize the following features in your student teaching program by checking the appropriate column.

	Not at all	A small amount	A good deal	Extensively	Don't know
Use of video-tape equipment with student teachers					
Use of tape recorders with student teachers					
Use of micro-teaching prior to or during student teaching					
Use of simulation techniques prior to or during student teaching					
Use of Flander's interaction analyse technique during student teaching					
Use of Taba's "teaching strategies" material during student teaching					
Use of Bloom's Taxonomy of Educational Objectives during student teaching					
Use of sensitivity training for student teachers					
Use of small group seminars with student teachers					

COOPERATING SCHOOL DISTRICTS AND COOPERATING TEACHERS

52. Do you have written contracts with the schools in which you place student teachers? ☐ Yes ☐ No

53. Please fill in the following chart showing the approximate distances from campus that you place student teachers.

	Minimum Distance	Average Distance	Maximum Distance
Elementary			
Secondary			

54. What was the approximate total number of cooperating teachers with whom you placed student teachers during the past school year (1966-67)?

- ☐ Under 25
- ☐ 26-50
- ☐ 51-100
- ☐ 101-200
- ☐ 201-500
- ☐ 501-1,000
- ☐ 1,001-1,500
- ☐ 1,501-2,000
- ☐ Over 2,000

55. Check any of the following techniques that you use to help train cooperating teachers.

☐ Offering a formal course in the supervision of student teaching

☐ Holding workshops for cooperating teachers

☐ Conducting small seminars with cooperating teachers

☐ Holding larger conferences on student teaching

☐ Mailing out student teaching newsletters to cooperating teachers

☐ Sending cooperating teachers to **state** conferences dealing with student teaching

☐ Sending cooperating teachers to **national** conferences dealing with student teaching.

☐ Other, please state: ____________________

____

56. Rank (1,2,3,4, etc.) according to importance, those characteristics that you look for in a cooperating teacher.

___ Subject matter competency

___ Knowledge of teaching methodology

___ Human relations skill

___ Possession of a bachelors degree

___ Possession of a masters degree

___ Willingness to work with student teachers

___ Having taken a course in Supervision of Student Teaching

___ Possession of a certificate for this type of work

___ Other, please state: ____________________

57. To what extent do your cooperating teachers exemplify the competencies that you consider to be most important for helping a student teacher

☐ Almost completely

☐ Very well

☐ Quite well

☐ To a limited extent

☐ Not at all

58. Check the statement which best describes your policy concerning payment to cooperating teachers and/or cooperating school systems for working with your student teachers.

☐ We do not pay for this service

☐ We make a payment to the school system

☐ We make a payment directly to the cooperating teacher

☐ Other, please explain: ____________________

____

59. What, if any, is the total amount that you pay **per student teacher?**

Per student teacher $____________

60. Please check any of those benefits which you provide for your cooperating teachers.

☐ Some type of college faculty status

☐ Free tuition for college courses

☐ Library privileges

☐ List names in the college catalog

☐ Free consultant service from the college

☐ Passes to athletic events

☐ Passes to concerts

☐ Other, please explain: ____________________

____

61. Do building principals receive payment for the placement of student teachers in their building? ☐ Yes ☐ No

If yes, what amount **per student teacher?** $________

62. Does your institution offer some type of graduate course dealing with "The Supervision of Student Teaching"? ☐ Yes ☐ No

If yes, approximately how many students enroll in the course each year? ________

63. Approximately what percent of your cooperating teachers have had a course in the supervision of student teachers?

☐ 0%

☐ 1-5%

☐ 6-10%

☐ 11-25%

☐ 26-50%

☐ 51-75%

☐ 76-100%

OE 6000 (REV. 9-66)

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

ERIC REPORT RESUME

ERIC ACCESSION NO.

CLEARINGHOUSE ACCESSION NUMBER

RESUME DATE	P.A.	T.A.
7-8-68		

IS DOCUMENT COPYRIGHTED? YES ☐ NO ☒

ERIC REPRODUCTION RELEASE? YES ☒ NO ☐

TITLE

FINAL REPORT; A NATIONAL SURVEY OF STUDENT TEACHING PROGRAMS

PERSONAL AUTHOR(S)

JOHNSON, JAMES A.

INSTITUTION (SOURCE)

NORTHERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY, DE KALB, ILLINOIS, COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

SOURCE CODE

REPORT/SERIES NO.

OTHER SOURCE

SOURCE CODE

OTHER REPORT NO.

OTHER SOURCE

SOURCE CODE

OTHER REPORT NO.

PUB'L. DATE 7-8-68

CONTRACT/GRANT NUMBER OEG-3-7-068182-2635

PAGINATION, ETC.

99 page report. Project No. 6-8182-2-12-1

RETRIEVAL TERMS

Final Report; A National Survey of Student Teaching Programs

IDENTIFIERS

Northern Illinois University

ABSTRACT

This study was designed to collect rather comprehensive descriptive information on student teaching in the United States. A rather lengthy questionnaire was sent to each teacher preparing institution in the country and returns were ultimately received from 847 institutions. This constitutes a 76% return. The information about the student teaching programs of these 847 institutions was tallied for each state and also for the entire country. Also, an analysis was made between public and private institutions, and between institutions that have received NCATE accreditation and institutions that have not received this accreditation. A great many basic and significant differences were found between public and private institutions, and between NCATE and non-NCATE institutions. A random sample of 10% of the schools that did not respond to the questionnaire were visited in an attempt to determine if the student teaching programs of the nonresponding institutions are basically the same as the student teaching programs of the responding institutions. While there were some minor differences between these two groups, it was concluded that the student teaching programs of the responding and nonresponding institutions are basically the same. The major findings of the study consist of a great deal of descriptive information about student teaching programs in the United States.

INNOVATIONS IN STUDENT TEACHING

Supplemental Report No. 1

Dr. James A. Johnson
Northern Illinois University
DeKalb, Illinois

8 July, 1968

NOTE: This report is intended to supplement the final report of A NATIONAL SURVEY OF STUDENT TEACHING PROGRAMS which was conducted under a grant from the U.S. Office of Education (Grant No. OEG 3-7-068182-2635). In this survey, a rather lengthy questionnaire was sent to each of the 1,110 teacher preparing institutions in the United States. Returns were received from 847 (or 76%) of these institutions. The final report just mentioned presents the general findings of this survey; however, this supplemental report elaborates upon the findings of item No. 22 on the questionnaire which asked, "Do you have what you consider to be any innovations in your student teaching program? ☐ Yes ☐ No. If Yes, briefly explain." Forty-five per cent of the respondents answered Yes to this question. This supplemental report presents the brief explanation offered by these institutions regarding their respective innovations in student teaching.

A NATIONAL SURVEY OF STUDENT TEACHING PROGRAMS

Innovations in the Student Teaching Program

INSTITUTION	INNOVATIONS
University of Alabama, University, Alabama	Student teaching programs in bi-national schools in Mexico and Columbia, South America
Jacksonville State University, Jacksonville, Alabama	Team teaching
Tuskegee Institute, Tuskegee, Alabama	Seminars
Alabama College, Montevallo, Alabama	Video tape
Auburn University, Auburn, Alabama	Pre-teaching field experience, extended lab experience, and experience in several situations
University of South Alabama, Mobile, Alabama	Laboratory experience begins in the Freshman year, are culminated with student teaching
Alaska Methodist University, Anchorage, Alaska	Student teaching experience in Bush schools if desired
Arizona State University, Tempe, Arizona	Small experimental elementary apprentice teaching program - small graduate teaching fellowship program
Arkansas State University, State University, Arkansas	Special methods courses to students before they student teach in public schools - Secondary
Little Rock University, Little Rock, Arkansas	Part time and full time operations - assignments for in-service teachers
Arkansas State University, State University, Arkansas	Entire semester - all day, 5 days a week for elementary student teachers

INSTITUTION	INNOVATIONS
Harding College, Searcy, Arkansas	A seminar, conducted during the 9 weeks attempts to keep contact and allow for group expression of common problems
La Verne College, La Verne, California	Team teaching - modular scheduling and similar situations
San Francisco State College, San Francisco, California	Team teaching
Pepperdine College, Los Angeles, California	Elementary special student teaching 10 weeks full time followed by internship and special project for teachers in disadvantaged areas
Stanislaus State College, Turlock, California	Two student teachers in same classroom-different hours and/or same hours
Immaculate Heart College, Los Angeles, California	Internship preparation for which is done in school and will be assigned during regular term
Loyola University of Los Angeles, Los Angeles, California	Video tape and team teaching
Humboldt State College, Arcata, California	Elementary - student is in a classroom each quarter taking professional education courses
San Fernando Valley State College, Northridge, California	Student teaching and 2nd methods course concurrently - internship program
San Jose State College, San Jose, California	Micro-teaching - tutorial program
University of Southern California, Los Angeles, California	Teacher corps (urban and rural) "immersion" into community - T-A work (assistant, not aide) leading into student teaching responsibilities (remuneration for T-A work but not for student teaching)

INSTITUTION	INNOVATIONS
California State College at Los Angeles, Los Angeles, California	Micro-teaching
Chico State College, Chico, California	Elementary program: teach every basic subject on different levels and schools on a two weeks basic with last month teaching full time
California Lutheran College, Thousand Oaks, California	Video tape
Sonoma State College, Rohnert Park, California	Student advisory council - curriculum classes have laboratory sessions related to student teaching assignments
University of San Diego College for Men, San Diego, California	Daily student log
California Western University, San Diego, California	One full quarter of full time (8-5) student teaching - use of video tape
San Francisco College for Women, San Francisco, California	Seminar conducted concurrently with student teaching
Chapman College, Orange, California	Intern program wherein district provides full time supervisor for each 10-12 interns - supervisor on college staff and integrates theory and practice
Temple Buell College, Denver, Colorado	Students go ½ days 3 times a week and full days 2 times a week
Adams State College, Alamosa, Colorado	Video tapes
University of Denver, Denver, Colorado	Teacher aide in addition to student teaching
University of Colorado, Boulder, Colorado	Off-campus emphasis in cooperation with local school district

INSTITUTION	INNOVATIONS
Colorado State College, Greeley, Colorado	Internship program
The Colorado College, Colorado Springs, Colorado	Each secondary student teacher is supervised by a specialist in his academic field. All student teachers attend a weekly colloquiem on Liberal Education and public school teaching - Video taping
Hartford Seminary Foundation, Hartford, Connecticut	Create curricula
University of Bridgeport, Bridgeport, Connecticut	Each field associate must have had two student teachers before appointment and be recommended by the principal of his school and by college of education personnel. He must be willing to take at least two student teachers every three years
Fairfield University, Fairfield, Connecticut	Group process principles are followed
Central Connecticut State College, New Britain, Connecticut	Plant school, Farmington-Newington Project, outdoor education experience, Hartford inner city, public educational services for children, Children's Museum, etc.
Eastern Connecticut State College, Willimantic, Connecticut	Early childhood program
Yale University, New Haven, Connecticut	Student teaching done in conjunction with graduate study in subject field
Albertus Magnus College, New Haven, Connecticut	The director teaches in student teachers in a seminar one period a week, first and second semester
Annhurst College, Woodstock, Connecticut	Student teaching done in Junior year
Southern Connecticut State College, New Haven, Connecticut	Participate 1 hour a week during the Junior year in addition to the 8 week full time student teaching period (24)

INSTITUTION	INNOVATIONS
Howard University, Washington, D.C.	Elementary: 5 weeks observation in each elementary grade - 9 weeks of student teaching in 1 grade
District of Columbia Teachers College, Washington, D.C.	Integrated methods and psychology during student teaching for elementary majors and professional semester for secondary
Gallauder College Graduate School, Washington, D.C.	Functions of clinical professors who both teach graduate courses and supervise
The American University, Washington, D.C.	Centers set aside for part of our student teachers
University of Miami, Coral Gables, Florida	Pairing 2 student teachers with one experienced teacher in "culturally - disadvantaged" schools
University of South Florida, Tampa, Florida	Multiple assignments to schools rather than to individual supervisors
University of Florida, Gainesville, Florida	One resident coordinator student teaching center - student teachers and directing teachers are trained the quarter before student teaching in verbal interaction analysis
Barry College, Miami, Florida	Interns begin full time teaching in November preceded by full week in September and 9 weeks of part time before November experience begins
Florida Presbyterian College, St. Petersburg, Florida	Directed pre-professional teaching experiences
University of Tampa, Tampa, Florida	All faculty members in Education Department supervise student teachers
Rollins College, Winter Park, Florida	36 hours pre-student teaching observation in conjunction with methods courses for undergraduates only

INSTITUTION	INNOVATIONS
Florida Southern College, Lakeland, Florida	Consistent working cooperation with directing teachers and principals and the selection of students to participate in student teaching
Emary University, Altanta, Georgia	Junior experience for elementary student teaching - use of video tape
Georgia Southern College, Statesboro, Georgia	Use of teaching field contact persons; center leader and team leader approach, etc.
Albany State College, Albany, Georgia	Secondary: team teaching and television teaching
Savannah State College, Savannah, Georgia	Weekly seminars - student teachers return to campus; Negro student teachers in predominantly white schools; spend orientation period with assigned supervising teacher prior to student teaching
University of Hawaii, Honolulu	Student teachers have legal status by state law - our best innovation is in Beginning Teacher Development
Northwest Nazarene College, Nampa, Idaho	Professional term - video tape - visual materials used in methods classes
The College of Idaho, Coldwell, Idaho	Unified program of general methods course content, observation period, and student teaching
Southern Illinois University, Carbondale, Illinois	Full professional quarter of student teaching - pre-lab experiences
Illinois Wesleyan University, Bloomington, Illinois	Junior participation with teacher who will be the student's cooperating teacher when student teaching
Western Illinois University, Macomb, Illinois	Resident coordinators in off-campus centers
Northern Illinois University, DeKalb, Illinois	Video tape

INSTITUTION	INNOVATIONS
Greenville College, Greenville, Illinois	Opening week of school spent with the public school teacher followed by five weeks of classes, then 8 weeks spent with the public school teacher
National College of Education, Evanston, Illinois	Professional seminar
North Central College, Naperville, Illinois	Closed circuit television
The University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois	Student teaching as part of practicum
Northeastern Illinois State College, Chicago, Illinois	Micro teaching prior to student teaching
North Park College and Theological Seminary, Chicago, Illinois	Field work prior to student teaching
Eastern Illinois University, Charleston, Illinois	Micro teaching - pre-student teaching labs
Principia College, Elsah, Illinois	Department chairman help students in all areas of our work
Rockford College, Rockford, Illinois	Integrated "teaching semester," team taught by members of department with various field trips sandwiched around student teaching
Knox College, Galesburg, Illinois	Video taping
Millikin University, Decatur, Illinois	Pre-student teaching contact in the classroom before the block placement
Barat College, Lake Forest, Illinois	20 hours of observation in a public school
Augustana College, Rock Island, Illinois	Full day student teaching - Pass or Fail grading for student teaching - student on Teacher Education Committee
Bradley University, Peoria, Illinois	Pre-student teaching lab experiences
Anderson College, Anderson, Indiana	Student exchange - television amplificater - team teaching - work study program

INSTITUTION	INNOVATIONS
Earlham College, Richmond, Indiana	Working in inner city schools and making urban studies
Purdue University, Lafayette, Indiana	Decentralized supervision; public school supervision of beginning teachers
University of Notre Dame, Notre Dame, Indiana	Field supervisors and staff associates
DePauw University, Greencastle, Indiana	Use of television in conferences
Franklin College of Indiana, Franklin, Indiana	Block program involving observation in classes where students will ultimately student teach
Indiana State University, Terre Haute, Indiana	Video tape
Goshen College, Goshen, Indiana	Elementary - student teaching semester for professional workshops and teaching
Valparaiso University, Valparaiso, Indiana	6-9-3 weeks semester plan - courses, student teaching, seminar respectfully
Saint Mary-of-the-Woods College, Saint Mary-of-the-Woods, Indiana	Our seminar for student teachers allows for a kind of "independent study" approach
Hanover College, Hanover, Indiana	Professional semester during which the student has no courses except those in professional education and student teaching
Butler University, Indianapolis, Indiana	Professional semester of secondary education
St. Mary's College, Notre Dame, Indiana	Observation in Junior year - pre-student teaching experiences

INSTITUTION	INNOVATIONS
Manchester College, North Manchester, Indiana	Use of vidoe taping
University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa	Professional semester in education
Graceland College, Lamoni, Iowa	Attempt to individualize the student teaching experience
Iowa State University, Ames, Iowa	Elementary: One 6 weeks experience in lower elementary, one 6 weeks experience in upper elementary (where possible in opposing socio-economical levels)
Northwestern College, Orange City, Iowa	Seminar of ½ day, second week in which cooperating teachers come to campus for discussion, instruction, questions answered
University of Northern Iowa, Cedar Falls, Iowa	Micro teaching, extensive interview procedure, video taping of student teaching experience in public schools
Central College, Pella, Iowa	Professional term - micro teaching - video tape supervision of student teaching
Briar Cliff College, Sioux City, Iowa	Video taping on location
Loras College, Dubuque, Iowa	Student teachers have been tape recording elementary classes for over 4 years
Clarke College, Dubuque, Iowa	September experiences - two weeks in elementary public schools before returning to the college campus - tutoring

INSTITUTION	INNOVATIONS
Friends University, Wichita, Kansas	Micro-teaching- Video taping- Interaction Analysis
Marymount College, Salina, Kansas	Video taping
Sacred Heart College, Wichita, Kansas	Simulated laboratory for pre-student teaching
Saint Mary College, Leavenworth, Kansas	Student teaching with honors
Washburn University, Topeka, Kansas	Weekly seminars with college and Menninger Foundation Staff Members
Kansas State University, Manhattan, Kansas	September observation experience (attend public school teacher meeting and first week of classes)
Kansas State College of Pittsburg, Pittsburg, Kansas	Use of closed cerquit T. V. and video tape
Mt. St. Scholastica College, Atchison, Kansas	Video tape and combined education department with St. Benedict's College
Wichita State University, Wichita, Kansas	Professional semester-secondary. Block classes and participation in schools in 7 weeks prior to actual student teaching. Subject matter specialists supervise student teachers
Eastern Kentucky University, Richmond, Kentucky	Team Teaching
Nazareth College, Nazareth, Kentucky	Interns (4 to 1 supervisor) who have complete charge of classroom for entire school year
Morehead State University, Morehead, Kentucky	Professional semester with rotation for student teaching experience
Catherine Spalding College, Louisville, Kentucky	Intern program in one school for priests-teachers
Villa Madonna College, Covington, Kentucky	Both members of Department of Education and members of academic departments supervise student teachers

INSTITUTION	INNOVATIONS
Berea College, Berea, Kentucky	Assignments
Asbury College, Wilmore, Kentucky	O.E.O. - Head Start program on campus
Northwestern State College, Natchitoches, Louisiana	Observation - participation at the secondary level. We have conducted an observation-participation program at the elementary level for a number of years.
Northeast Louisiana State College, Monroe, Louisiana	Video tape - micro teaching - pre-lab observations
Nicholls State College, Thibodaux, Louisiana	Internship program at the elementary level
Xavier University, New Orleans, Louisiana	Student teachers become a part of these programs or pilot studies: non-graded, department programs in 6,7, & 8 grades, etc. All such programs are cooperatively worked out between college program and regular school programs
Louisiana Polytechnic Institute, Ruston, Louisiana	Do not give A,B,C marks in professional lab experience
Our Lady of Holy Cross College, New Orleans, Louisiana	Prior to the semester of student teaching, these students are required to do 36 hours of teacher aid work. (no credit)
St. May's Dominican College, New Orleans, Louisiana	Longer period of observation and participation- video taping or student teachers at work- micro-teaching
Southern University, Baton Rouge, Louisiana	Program designed for the training of Junior High School teachers
University of Maryland, College Park, Maryland	Teacher education centers- coordinated by a full-time joint appointee of university and public schools.

INSTITUTION	INNOVATIONS
Hood College, Frederick, Maryland	Junior aide program
The Maryland Institute, College of Art, Baltimore, Maryland	Graduate program in co-operation with Hillcrest Children's Center, Washington, D.C., leading to title of Art Therapist in Special Education
Frostburg State College, Frostburg, Maryland	An increased interest and sharing of training, both on campus and in the field of practice, by the content instructors of the majors in which the students are working. Notably to date in English, Geography, Mathematics, Physical Education, Art, and Music.
Peabody Conservatory, Baltimore, Maryland	Spread over a 2 year period
Columbia Union College, Takoma Park, Maryland	Some work in boarding schools within 200 mile radius
University of Massachusetts, Amherst, Massachusetts	A pilot program with 15 weeks of student teaching planned for next semester (elementary)
State College at Framingham, Framingham, Massachusetts	Limited number of students in inner-city schools.
Salem State College, Salem, Massachusetts	Block or group assignments to foster team teaching and to provide more concentrated supervision
Boston College, Chestnut Hill, Massachusetts	Some center - excellent college supervisor-student teacher ratio
State College at Worcester, Worcester, Massachusetts	Cooperating teachers conferences for teachers, department chairmen, supervisors, and principals
State College at Bridgewater, Bridgewater, Massachusetts	Professional semester, 16 weeks - ½ day at laboratory school and ½ day integrated with methods classes

INSTITUTION	INNOVATIONS
Northeastern University, Boston, Massachusetts	About 25% of students have prior paid positions as "teacher aides"
Eastern Nazarene College, Wallaston, Massachusetts	A required 180 hours of observation and serving as teacher aide before student teaching
Boston University, Boston, Massachusetts	Centers established in elementary and secondary education. 10-12 student teachers in one school with a supervisor out 2½ days a week
Stonehill College, North Easton, Massachusetts	Clinical professor approach
Suffolk University, Boston, Massachusetts	Summer program - experimented with reimbursing cooperating teachers in Newton school system. Student paid extra $50.00, Suffolk University matched with $50.00, and Newton matched the $100.00, so cooperating teacher received $200.00
College of Our Lady of the Elms, Chicopas, Massachusetts	Students do this work in their home cities during the first eight weeks of public school- September and October
Gordon College, Wenham, Massachusetts	Methods course taught in a block with two mornings per week observation in the public school classroom
Cardinal Cushing College, Brookline, Massachusetts	Prerequisite - 50 hours work with children in age group plan to teach
Lesley College, Cambridge, Massachusetts	Student teaching centers in public school systems
Massachusetts College of Art, Boston, Massachusetts	Student teaching center concept with joint responsibility
Merrimack College, North Andover, Massachusetts	In-service teachers as teachers of courses in special methods

INSTITUTION	INNOVATIONS
Atlantic Union College, South Lancaster, Massachusetts	Pre-student teaching laboratory requirements
Nazareth College, Kalamazoo, Michigan	New program to be aimed at inner-city teaching
Aquinas College, Grand Rapids, Michigan	Block of elementary professional education
Andrews University, Berrien Springs, Michigan	Closed circuit T.V. for evaluation
Spring Arbor College, Spring Arbor, Michigan	Twin Valley Center - 4 colleges and universities
Wayne State University, Detroit, Michigan	Elementary student teaching centers-special student teaching center for inner - city teacher preparation-student teaching in Canada- student teaching in Job Corp center
Hope College, Holland, Michigan	Five are in a whole year "teacher associate" program in Saugatuck. Three are expecting to participate in the Philadelphia program of GLCA
Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan	Elementary intern program, clustering arrangement leading to more individualized instruction
Alma College, Alma, Michigan	Experimenting with all day student teaching in elementary schools for one term. Cooperating program in ghetto area teaching in Detroit with Detroit P.S. and Wayne State University (1967-68)
University of Detroit, Detroit, Michigan	Team teaching in the secondary level (3 and 4 student in a team)
Adrian College, Adrian, Michigan	Professional semester
Kalamazoo College, Kalamazoo, Michigan	An inner city program

INSTITUTION	INNOVATIONS
Adrian College, Adrian, Michigan	Professional semester - ½ days until mid semester then full days
College of St. Thomas, St. Paul, Minnesota	Internship
Moorhead State College, Moorhead, Minnesota	IBM card application. One half day a week joint meeting with supervising teacher, college supervisor, and member of major academic department
State College, St. Cloud, Minnesota	Program controlled by a council which is a non-profit tax exempt corporation with a representative from each school district
St. Olaf College, Northfield, Minnesota	A possible outgrowth of a Sophomore Internship program which won an AACTE distinguished award for excellence in teacher education, 1968
Carleton College, Northfield, Minnesota	ACM urban semester in Chicago - some video taping of student teaching
College of St. Scholastica, Duluth, Minnesota	Student teaching in an individualized program - we train them for this
Concordia College, St. Paul, Minnesota	Two experiences - ½ day for 5 weeks for Juniors and ½ quarter full days for Seniors
Gustavus Adolphus College, St. Peter, Minnesota	Professional semester of 15 weeks (combines methods and Educational Psychology in 7 weeks, student teach in other 8 weeks)
Hamline University, St. Paul, Minnesota	Early assignment - spring before fall term work
Mankato State College, Mankato, Minnesota	Seminar in student teaching - weekly on-campus seminar - one day each college quarter

INSTITUTION	INNOVATIONS
Tougaloo College, Tougaloo, Mississippi	We place our student teachers only in schools located near our college
William Carey College, Hattiesburg, Mississippi	Cooperating teachers are invited to a coffee hour during American Education Week. We also give a free scholarship to each - good for one course. Also to the superving principal
Mississippi State College for Women, Columbus, Mississippi	September experience and pre- student teaching lab experience
Jackson State College, Jackson, Mississippi	Regular school term in-service growth program for supervising teachers, including participation in national conferences, observational tours
Evangel College, Springfield, Missouri	Student teaching coordinator appointed by the Springfield School System to supervise and coordinate the program for the three colleges in Springfield
Webster College, St. Louis, Missouri	Departmental involvement in methods and student teaching; involvement of students in methods, curriculum development and student teaching from Sophomore year on
Harris Teachers College, St. Louis, Missouri	Student teachers spend two weeks at each grade level thru grade 8; also, are assigned to two schools in contrasting socio-economic areas of the city for ten weeks each
Marillac College, St. Louis, Missouri	Student teaching takes place during a professional semester, the first 6 weeks of which are devoted to special methods courses which are concluded after 10 weeks of student teaching
University of Missouri, Columbia, Missouri	Video tape - each student teacher doing at least one lesson

INSTITUTION	INNOVATIONS
Central Missouri State College, Warrensburg, Missouri	Inner city program - pre student teaching experience, followed by special student teaching experience in inner city schools. We also use video tape extensively for those student teaching in lab school
Tarkio College, Tarkio, Missouri	Student teaching block of (1) principles and planning in teaching and (2) student teaching. Each full time for ½ term each
Rockhurst College, Kansas City, Missouri	15 area liberal arts colleges are running a full semester inner city cooperating student teaching program
Eastern Montana College, Billings, Montana	Television filming of student teacher and future student teachers, to a limited degree
Carroll College, Helena, Montana	Professional semester
Western Montana College, Dillon, Montana	Secondary student teachers out 8 weeks, then return for 33 hour workshop
Montana State University, Bozeman, Montana	Video tape
Rocky Mountain College, Billings, Montana	We do the things that other people say they do
Union College, Lincoln, Nebraska	Pre-semester student teachers report when the teachers do for in-service
Omaha University, Omaha, Nebraska	Video tape
Chadron State College, Chadron, Nebraska	Micro-teaching prior to student teaching experience
University of Nebraska, Lincoln, Nebraska	Television and instant playback for the purpose of analyzing student teaching and employing Interaction Analysis and one or two other observational systems

INSTITUTION	INNOVATIONS
Concordia Teachers College, Seward, Nebraska	Use elementary school throughout the Mid-west (Ft. Wayne, Indiana, Milwaukee, St. Louis, Denver, Tucson, Phoenix, Ponca City, Oklahoma, etc.) Secondary school is Detroit, Cleveland, St. Louis, Denver, etc.
University of New Hampshire, Durham, New Hampshire	Student teachers placed in "tandem teams" with Interaction Analysis training
St. Anselm's College, Manchester, New Hampshire	Placing 3-5 students with one master teacher - one class
Bloomfield College, Bloomfield, New Jersey	Pre-student teaching conferences involving cooperating teacher and student teacher and supervising teacher
Glassboro State College, Glassboro, New Jersey	Inner-city semester with the disadvantaged
Jersey City State College, Jersey City, New Jersey	Professional semester
Westminster Choir College, Princeton, New Jersey	Students do their elementary practicum during Sophomore year
Upsala College, East Orange, New Jersey	In-course use of simulated instructional sessions and video taping. This is prior to student teaching
Rider College, Trenton, New Jersey	Our methods instructors are also our supervisors
Eastern New Mexico University, Portoles, New Mexico	Ungraded elementary team teaching
University of New Mexico, Albuquerque, New Mexico	Modular scheduling, team teaching supervising, lab experiences for each methods course, satellite lab schools
New Mexico State University, Las Cruces, New Mexico	Micro-teaching and video taping

INSTITUTION	INNOVATIONS
Mills College of Education, New York, New York	Two student teaching experiences in Junior and Senior year - observation in child care center
La Mayne College, Syracuse, New York	Block program - methods prior to student teaching
St. Joe's College for Women, Brooklyn, New York	A child study center, K-primary
Mary Rogers College, Maryknoll, New York	Residency for some with the cooperating faculty of practice school
City College, New York, New York	Placement of elementary student teacher in Special Service School in New York City in which the students receive $2.50 per hour
Medaille College, Buffalo, New York	During third year, students work with a teacher 30 clock hours a tri-mester. Total credit hours - 3
St. Lawrence University, Canton, New York	"Professional semester" for student teachers during senior year. No academic campus courses taken. Professional courses only plus 8 weeks full time teaching in public schools
Brentwood College, Brentwood, New York	Each student records a lesson in her self-evaluation. Weekly seminars in an elementary school with demonstrations by experienced teachers
State University College at Fredonia, Fredonia, New York	Clinical analysis/building approach in addition to conventional one student teacher assigned to one classroom teacher approach
Skidmore College, Saratoga Springs, New York	Elementary - full semester block program, integrating theory and practice
State University of New York, College at Cortland, Cortland, New York	Participation in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania program

INSTITUTION	INNOVATIONS
D'Youville College, Buffalo, New York	Team supervision to begin next year
Pratt College, Brooklyn, New York	Outstanding public school teachers and administrators are hired as teaching assistants to the college to aid in planning program and supervising students
State University of New York at Geneseo, Geneseo, New York	All supervisors teach methods courses as well as supervise
Cornell University, Ithaca, New York	Non-graded team
Marist College, Poughkeepsie, New York	Confine to one semester of intensive theory and practice teaching
Houghton College, Houghton, New York	All fall placements beginning with opening faculty meeting
Fordhan University, New York, New York	Student teaching is part of Senior course in learning teaching methods; junior year course in Urban child, including field work and observation
State University College at Potsdam, Potsdam, New York	Paired groups - same system, different levels
State University College at Oswego, Oswego, New York	Teachers and student teachers assigned in teams making possible peer supervision and clinical analysis by other groups with subsequent presentation of data to the one who taught the lesson
The King's College, Briarcliff Manor, New York	Two 8 week accelerated professional courses to free last 8 weeks for secondary student teaching
The University of Rochester, Rochester, New York	Block program - instructional team (U. faculty) highly individualized

INSTITUTION	INNOVATIONS
Syracuse University, Syracuse, New York	Research study in developing supervisory skills of cooperating teachers
State University College, Brockport, New York	Simulation in student teaching
New York University, New York, New York	"Apprentice teachers" receive pay for assisting teacher while fulfilling student teaching requirements. They are employees of Department of Education and well as student of University
Elmira College, Elmire, New York	Team taught professional sequence cored by experience program
State University of New York at Albany, Albany, New-York	Center concept - professor of student teaching in residence - teaches classes
Queens College of the City University of New York, Flushing, New York	Special lab schools-other special programs for training for urban experience
Roberts Wesleyan College, North Chili, New York	11 week period - two weeks of seminars
Western Carolina University, Cullowkee, North Carolina	Student teaching centers
North Carolina University, Raleigh, North Carolina	Making a study at the community in which student teaching is done as a means of planning the instructional program in terms of local situation and need
Pembroke State College, Pembroke, North Carolina	Students attend classes 8 weeks and teach full time 8 weeks
Salem College, Winston-Salem, North Carolina	Incorporation of all "courses" into sequential lab workshop discussion types. An academic major for elementary as well as secondary and many others
University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, North Carolina	Training center using 3 public schools

INSTITUTION	INNOVATIONS
Greensboro College, Greensboro, North Carolina	Pro-teaching at beginning of public school in student's home town. Education field work
Saint Augustine's College, Raleigh, North Carolina	More involvement with subject matter professors and mass media or educational technology
Lenoir Rhyne College, Hickory, North Carolina	College supervisor video tapes actual classroom episodes in public schools, using portable apparatus. Student teacher views playback, criticizes, etc.
Mary College, Bismarck, North Dakota	Seminar each week on "art ideas" things tried - how to get "variations" and "take-offs"
University of North Dakota, Grand Forks, North Dakota	Research and experimentation in student teaching in operation in several areas
College of Mount St. Joseph, Mount St. Joseph, Ohio	Advisory committee to Education Department (1 superintendent, 3 principals, 3 cooperating teachers, 2 student teachers) to advise on student teaching and general education program. Use of movie camera and tape recorder
Walsh College, Canton, Ohio	Student teaching is done full day for 8 weeks at beginning of senior year, spring semester
Central State University, Wilberforce, Ohio	Participation in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania Urban Student Teaching Laboratory
Hiram College, Hiram, Ohio	(1) Internship in a school-student relationship from time entering T.E. program to beginning of student teaching. (2) Substantial time allowance in load for faculty acting as college supervisor (student teaching= two 5-hour courses in our load formula)
University of Cincinnati, Cincinnati, Ohio	Provision for "non-standard" students who have degrees but no work in education

INSTITUTION	INNOVATIONS
University of Toledo, Toledo, Ohio	Student teaching centers where 12-18 are placed in one school
Case - Western Reserve University, Cleveland, Ohio	Earlier field experience, beginning at Sophomore level and continuing thru the student teaching experience with same cooperating teacher
Miami University, Oxford, Ohio	Video tape student teachers in public schools
Muskingum College, New Concord, Ohio	The month of January may be spent in a metropolitan area school
John Carroll University, Cleveland, Ohio	Individual matching through personal contacts of student teacher with cooperating teacher
Capital University, Columbus, Ohio	Educational semester with full day student teaching
Xavier University, Cincinnati, Ohio	Video tape
Mary Manse College, Toledo, Ohio	Changed marks to Satisfactory - Unsatisfactory
Baldwin - Wallace College, Berea, Ohio	We have added pre-student teaching school visitation and lab experience to already existing program
Otterbein College, Westerville, Ohio	Professional semester - 1st 8 weeks, 3 education courses and 2nd 8 weeks, full time in public schools
Ohio Northern University, Ada, Ohio	Possible dual experience - primary and elementary
Oberlin College, Oberlin, Ohio	Elementary - two 8 week blocks in middle of each semester
Youngstown State University, Youngstown, Ohio	One semester of observation at the beginning of the Junior year - this also includes participation
Ashland College, Ashland, Ohio	Students assigned in teams of two per classroom; CCTV used for part of evaluation

INSTITUTION	INNOVATIONS
University of Dayton, Dayton, Ohio	Video tape and micro-teaching
Saint John College, Cleveland, Ohio	Laboratory experiences beginning in Freshman year and culminating in student teaching in the Senior year
Ohio University, Athens, Ohio	Students are assigned in team teaching and non-graded situations
Northwestern State College, Alva, Oklahoma	Video tape
University of Oklahoma, Norman, Oklahoma	Human relation workshop concerning disadvantaged and University children
University of Tulsa, Tulsa, Oklahoma	Video tace and micro-teaching
Southwestern State College, Weatherford, Oklahoma	Student teachers are placed each 8 weeks - four times a year
Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, Oklahoma	Two weeks observation at the start of the school year
University of Oregon, Eugene, Oregon	Clinical supervision, internships, block experiences
Pacific University, Forest Grove, Oregon	Micro-teaching prior to actual teaching
Southern Oregon College, Ashland, Oregon	Clinical supervision in elementary first quarter
Linfield College, McMinnville, Oregon	Interns out in the schools. We are using video tape and supervision by committees
Portland State College, Portland, Oregon	Cooperative clinical profession assignments with school districts
Lewis and Clark College, Portland, Oregon	Video tape
University of Portland, Portland, Oregon	Professional semester

INSTITUTION	INNOVATIONS
Mt. Angel College, Mt. Angel, Oregon	Sequential lab experiences leading up to student teaching
Millersville State College, Millersville, Pennsylvania	Length of time in student teaching varied according to accomplishment
Shippensburg State College, Shippensburg, Pennsylvania	E.T.U.
College Miselicordia, Dallas, Pennsylvania	Booklet filled out by student teacher, biographical sketch - hopes for student teaching sent to cooperating teacher
West Chester State College, West Chester, Pennsylvania	Team supervision by supervisor
University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburg, Pennsylvania	Four varied programs are involved each with innovations
Wilson College, Chambersburg, Pennsylvania	Team teaching and video tape
Bucknell University, Louisburg, Pennsylvania	In secondary, a research - oriented approach emphasizing development of concepts
Temple University, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania	Center approach with resident superintendent - joint supervision with City of Philadelphia - staff developmental program for principals, cooperating teachers
Muhlenberg College, Allentown, Pennsylvania	Each elementary student teacher has 2 assignments; half semester in primary; half in intermediate
Allegheny College, Meadville, Pennsylvania	Mandatory five-year involving full pay, full year internship (after student teaching) and MA degree
The Pennsylvania State University, University Park, Pennsylvania	Pre-student teaching experiences and September experience for all students

INSTITUTION	INNOVATIONS
University of Scranton, Scranton, Pennsylvania	Observation through structured observation forms - very flexible
Holy Family College, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania	Pre-student teaching observations and seminars
Villamor University, Villamor, Pennsylvania	Full semester - student follows school
Messiah College, Grantham, Pennsylvania	Methods work coordinated with student teaching
Slippey Rock State College, Slippey Rock, Pennsylvania	Varied experiences for student teachers
Rosemont College, Rosemont, Pennsylvania	Professional semester
Drexel Institute of Technology, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania	Cooperative education program - send students to teach in local schools, and they receive credit for student teaching
Washington and Jefferson College, Washington, Pennsylvania	Intern program the 1st semester of Senior year; student teaching the 2nd semester
Waynesbury College, Waynesbury, Pennsylvania	Professional semester for liberal arts majors - we have no secondary education major
Lebanon Valley College, Annville, Pennsylvania	Follow-up on first year teachers
Wilkes College, Wilkes-Barre, Pennsylvania	Professional semester - two courses in education taken previously to the professional semester
Dickinson College, Carlisle, Pennsylvania	Professional semester - field practicum in Educational Psycology during pre-student teaching
Carnegie Mellon University, Pittsburg, Pennsylvania	Professional semester

INSTITUTION	INNOVATIONS
Marywood College, Scranton, Pennsylvania	Supervision through classroom interaction analysis technique - establishment of specific centers at a distance from the college
Catholic University of Puerto Rico, Ponce, Puerto Rico	A program with Department of Public Instruction wherin Sophomores, Juniors, Seniors form University spend 6 hours a week in public schools with teachers
University of Puerto Rico, Rio Piedras, Puerto Rico	Micro-teaching
Brown University, Providence, Rhode Island	Fellowship programs federally funded during which the student receives benefits much as the AYI science program
Rhode Island College, Providence Rhode Island	Area schools and coordinating supervisors for area schools and area concentration
Providence College, Providence, Rhode Island	Micro-teaching
Bryant College, Providence, Rhode Island	Professional semester
Bob Jones University, Greenville, South Carolina	Video tape
Clemson University, Clemson, South Carolina	Team teaching
Allen University, Columbia, South Carolina	Teacher-helper program in elementary education
South Carolina State College, Orangeburg, South Carolina	Integrative seminars held prior to and after student teaching
Lander College, Greenwood, South Carolina	Block scheduling of program during year in which student teaching takes place
Claflin College, Orangeburg, South Carolina	Block system

INSTITUTION	INNOVATIONS
Benedict College, Columbia, South Carolina	Blocking student teaching for last semester of Senior year
Northern State College, Aberdeen, South Dakota	Television recorders
Dakota Wesleyan University, Mitchell, South Dakota	Planned team approach in classroom setting
South Dakota State University, Brookings, South Dakota	Team teaching - ETV - independent study
General Beadle State College, Madison, South Dakota	Team teaching
Covenant College, Chattanoga, Tennessee	Weekly seminar
Bethel College, McKenzie, Tennessee	Team teaching
Austin Peay State University, Clarksville, Tennessee	Seminar prior to student teaching - use of interaction analysis
George Peabody College, Nashville, Tennessee	Professional semester
University of Tennessee, Knoxville, Tennessee	Interaction analysis - video tape - simmulated experiences to some extent
Siena College, Memphis, Tennessee	Professional semester
Carson - Newman College, Jefferson City, Tennessee	Block program - video tape for student teaching
Tusculum College, Greenevill, Tennessee	One half semester full time in public school; first one half in a block education course
Tennessee Technological University, Cookeville, Tennessee	Prepare teachers of rural disadvantaged; humanistic supervision
Milligan College, Milligan College, Tennessee	Professional semester

INSTITUTION	INNOVATIONS
Lambuth College, Jackson, Tennessee	In elementary reading course, students are assigned teacher in public school during semester preceding student teaching. This student continues under same teacher the following semester for student teaching, which in effect is a year of internship
Christian Brothers College, Memphis, Tennessee	All student teaching is done is summer session
Union University, Jackson, Tennessee	Pre-requisite courses are offered during the first half of the semester in which the student teacher teaches
Texas A & I University, Kingsville, Texas	Workshop for cooperating teachers
The University of Texas, Austin, Texas	Team teaching - Latin American Education Program
Midwestern University, Wichita Falls, Texas	Professional semester
Austin College, Sherman, Texas	MAT
St. Edward's University, Austin, Texas	Use of Flandos analysis - micro teaching on limited scale
Texas Southern University, Houston, Texas	Educational Media Institute
Paul Quinn College, Waco, Texas	Professional semester
North Texas State University, Denton, Texas	Professional semester of 15 hours of integrated study (elementary) - reverse block of 8 weeks of student teaching and 8 weeks of campus study (secondary)
Sul Ross State College, Alpine, Texas	No grade is given, all requirements must be completed prior to credit
Stephen F. Austin State College, Nacogdoches, Texas	Student teaching seminar immediately following student teaching

INSTITUTION	INNOVATIONS
Texas A & M University, College Station, Texas	Full time 9 weeks plus 6 weeks block on-campus courses for a total of 15 education credits - integrated curriculum in professional senior semester
Weber State College, Ogden, Utah	Intern program
College of Southern Utah, Cedar City, Utah	Secondary supervisors in education
Utah State University, Logan, Utah	Video tape
Brigham Young University, Provo, Utah	Micro teaching - team teaching
University of Utah, Salt Lade City, Utah	Student teaching centers in selected schools - teaching assistantships preceding student teaching
University of Vermont, Vermont	Internship
Johnson State College, Johnson, Vermont	Team teaching - video tape
Norwich University, Northfield, Vermont	Use of non-education department faculty to supervise and evaluate student teachers
Virginia Union University, Richmond, Virginia	Cadet teacher exchange program with midwestern college
Radford College, Radford, Virginia	In secondary school assignment in 3 subjects, 3 grade levels, experience with 3 supervising teachers
Eastern Mennonite College, Harrisonburg, Virginia	Junior year pre-student teaching experience
University of Virginia, Charlottesville, Virginia	A pre-student teaching course - micro teaching, analytic methods of studying teaching and learning behaviors
Virginia State College, Petersburg, Virginia	Publications, seminars, and September experiences

INSTITUTION	INNOVATIONS
St. Martin's College, Olympia, Washington	Interaction analysis
Pacific Lutheran University, Tacoma, Washington	Alternate levels available; elementary candidates in secondary and secondary candidates in elementary
Eastern Washington State College, Cheney, Washington	Voluntary practicum in supervision of student teaching. Slower developing students may take an extended experience
University of Washington, Seattle, Washington	Students spend entire year in school
Fort Wright College, Spokane, Washington	Use of slide camera to record student reaction during teaching act
Whitman College, Walla Walla, Washington	Interaction analysis - Micro-teaching
Central Washington State College, Ellensburg, Washington	Video tape
Glenville State College, Glenville, West Virginia	Student teaching packet
Davis and Elkins College, Elkins, West Virginia	Student teaching block
Marshall University, Houtington, West Virginia	Utilization of multiple assignments in our school to experiment with an individualized instructional approach
West Virginia University, Morgantown, West Virginia	Micro-teaching and interaction analysis
West Virginia State College, Institute, West Virginia	We require candidates without teaching experience who are approved for summer session student teaching to complete 50-60 clock hours work as teacher aide We give 5 hours credit only for summer session student teaching
West Virginia Wesleyan College, Buckhannon, West Virginia	Internship program
Marian College of Fond du Lac, Fond du Lac, Wisconsin	Professional semester with September experience

INSTITUTION	INNOVATIONS
Viterbo College, La Crosse, Wisconsin	Interaction analysis
Carthage College, Kenosha, Wisconsin	Video tape
Lawrence University, Appleton, Wisconsin	Methods, guidance and reading are taught concurrently with the student teaching experience
Edgewood College, Madison, Wisconsin	Secondary level - change from full time during first 5 weeks to 3 hours per day and extending the methods courses until Christmas
Wisconsin State University-Oshkosh, Oshkosh, Wisconsin	Internship
University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wisconsin	Full time semester internships available to qualified graduate and undergraduate students in addition to the block time program, training of cooperating teachers, telesupervision
Wisconsin State University-Whitewater, Whitewater, Wisconsin	Experimental programs - clinical professionship
Wisconsin State University, Superior, Wisconsin	Exchange program
Carroll College, Waukesha, Wisconsin	Professional semester
Alverno College, Milwaukee, Wisconsin	Block program
Dominican College, Racine, Wisconsin	Six students per year live in core area and do their student teaching there
University of Wyoming, Laramie, Wyoming	We are exploring a fellowship-internship program via a federal grant.

STUDENT TEACHING RESEARCH GRANTS

Supplemental Report No. 2

Dr. James A. Johnson
Northern Illinois University
DeKalb, Illinois

8 July, 1968

NOTE: This report is intended to supplement the final report of A NATIONAL SURVEY OF STUDENT TEACHING PROGRAMS which was conducted under a grant from the U.S. Office of Education (Grant No. OEG 3-7-068182-2635). In this survey, a rather lengthy questionnaire was sent to each of the 1,110 teacher preparing institutions in the United States. Returns were received from 847 (or 76%) of these institutions. The final report just mentioned presents the general findings of this survey; however, this supplemental report elaborates upon the findings of questionnaire item No. 23 which asked, "Have you received any research grants in your student teaching program during the past two years? ☐ Yes ☐ No. If Yes: Amount of grant?; Source of grant?; and Title of research project?" Five per cent of the respondents answered Yes to this question. This supplemental report lists these institutions and the amount, source, and title of their respective research grants.

RESEARCH GRANTS IN STUDENT TEACHING PROGRAMS

INSTITUTION	AMOUNT	SOURCE	TITLE
University of Southern California, Los Angeles, Calif.	$103,800 (2 yrs) 750,000 (2 yrs)	Titles Vb Titles Vc	Prospective Teacher Fellowship and National Teachers Corps
Fort Lewis College, Durango, Colorado		Title III	English As a Second Language - B.T.A. work study program
Regis College, Denver, Colorado	30,000	Title I ESE A	
Southern Connecticut State College, New Haven, Conn.		Yale - C.A.P Agency	Scranton Tutorial Project
Yale University, New Haven, Connecticut		Title I	Community Problems - Schools, New Haven
Fort Valley State College, Fort Valley, Georgia	4,900	Southern Education Foundation	Improving Competence of Cooperating Teachers
Georgia Southern College, Statesboro, Georgia	1,000	U.S. Office of Education	Utilization of Video tape in Student Teaching
Knox College, Galesburg, Ill.	35,000	Kettering Foundation	Summer Institute for Cooperating Teachers
Northern Illinois University, DeKalb, Illinois	8,000	U.S. Office of Education	A National Survey of Student Teaching Programs
Indiana State University, Terre Haute, Indiana	34,520	U.S. Office of Education	Isolating Relevant Variables in Student Teaching Assessment

INSTITUTION	AMOUNT	SOURCE	TITLE
University of Notre Dame, Notre Dame, Indiana	$ 52,000	U.S. Office of Education	I.A.G. grant for program development in several areas
Friends University, Wichita, Kansas	4,000	U.S. Government	An Experimental T.V. Center for Teacher Education
Marymount College, Salina, Kansas	4,450	Title III- Higher Education - Public Law 89-329	
University of Maryland, College Park, Maryland		U.S. Office of Education	
Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan	600	Michigan State University	Teacher Behavior Analysis (follow up of student teachers)
College of St. Scholastica, Duluth, Minnesota	1,200	Hill Foundation	Supervision and Evaluation of Student Teachers
College of St. Thomas, St. Paul, Minnesota		Upper Midwest Regional Educational Lab	
Gustanus Adolphus College, St. Peter, Minnesota	600	G.A.C. Research Fund	A Student Teaching Council With Public School Representatives
University of Nebraska, Lincoln, Nebraska	135,000 90,000- (T.V. equipment)	Mid-continent Regional Educational Lab	Techniques of Learning Teaching Processes

INSTITUTION	AMOUNT	SOURCE	TITLE
Columbia University, Teachers College, New York, New York	$ 30,000	Local College Funds	
Queens College of the City University of New York, Flushing, New York		V.S.O.E.	School-University Teacher Education Center
Skidmore College, Saratoga Springs, New York			Joint Local Public School and College Student Teaching Center
State University College, Brockport, New York	46,000	U.S. Office of Education	Simulation Project in Student Teaching
State University of New York at Geneseo, Geneseo, N.Y.	2,000	State Department of Education	A Component Task Analysis of Teaching
Syracuse University, Syracuse, New York	36,720	State Department of Education and Syracuse University	A Pilot Study of the Influence on Student Teachers of a Training Program for Cooperating Teachers in Inner-city Schools
North Carolina College, Durham, North Carolina	3,000	Southern Educational Foundation	Summer Institute for Cooperating Teachers
Linfield College, McMinnville, Oregon	50,000	Hill Family	Video tape work
Linfield College, McMinnville, Oregon	55,000		Upgrading Student Teachers and their Supervisors
University of Oregon, Eugene, Oregon	100,000	Prospective Teacher Program	

INSTITUTION	AMOUNT	SOURCE	TITLE
Carnegee Mellon University, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania	$ 36,000	U.S. Office of Education	Video tape in teacher preparation
Slippey Rock State College, Slippey Rock, Pennsylvania		Special Education	
Temple University, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania	10,000	U.S. Office of Education	Four Types of Supervising Conferences in Elementary Student Center Program
University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania	50,000	U.S. Office of Education - Title Vc	Experimental Secondary Teacher Education Program in Urban Areas for Recent Liberal Arts Graduates
Catholic University of Puerto Rico, Ponce, Puerto Rico	1,000,000	Title III	Operative and Maintainence of Supplementary Educational Center and Services
Coker College, Hartsville, South Carolina	7,000	Federal Government	Research in Pre-School Requirements
Memphis State University, Memphis, Tennessee	9,892	Federal Government	Selected Aspects of Self-Supervising Student Teachers
Texas A & M University, College Station, Texas	19,000	Institutional Grant - Title V	Application of Technology to the Improvement of Teaching
Washington State University, Pullman, Washington	5,000	Northwest Regional Lab - M-STEP	Multi-State Teacher Education Project

INSTITUTION	AMOUNT	SOURCE	TITLE
Marshall University, Houtington, West Virginia	$ 40,000	West Virginia Legislature	Experimental Project in Teacher Education
West Virginia State College, Institute, West Virginia		West Virginia Legislature	Multi-State Teacher Education Project
Wisconsin State University, Whitewater, Wisconsin		UMREL	Clinical Professorship Training Program

INTERNSHIP PROGRAMS

Supplement Report No. 3

Dr. James A. Johnson
Northern Illinois University
DeKalb, Illinois

8 July, 1968

NOTE: This report is intended to supplement the final report of A NATIONAL SURVEY OF STUDENT TEACHING PROGRAMS which was conducted under a grant from the U.S. Office of Education (Grant No. OEG 3-7-068182-2635). In this survey, a rather lengthy questionnaire was sent to each of the 1,110 teacher preparing institutions in the United States. Returns were received from 847 (or76%) of these institutions. The final report just mentioned presents the general findings of this survey; however, this supplemental report elaborates upon the findings of questionnaire item No. 26 which asked, "Does your institution operate any internship programs? ☐ Yes ☐ No. If Yes, very briefly explain the program(s)." Twenty-two per cent of the respondents answered this question Yes. This supplemental report lists each of these institutions and the brief explanation they offered.

INSTITUTIONS OPERATING INTERNSHIP PROGRAMS

INSTITUTION	PROGRAM
Tuskegee Institute, Tuskegee, Alabama	Graduate interns - MA people - elementary, secondary, guidance - one year
University of Arkansas, Fayetteville, Arkansas	Administrative internships - there is no internship program to develop specialists in student teacher supervision
California Lutheran College, Thousand Oaks, California	One week summer pre-service workshop, including 5 weeks of student teaching, video playback, cooperation with local public schools, and 5 days a week program
California State College at Fullerton, Fullerton, California	Special program in Biology where district teachers are released to work on a masters degree
California State Polytechnic College, San Luis Obispo, California	The student teachers in the agriculture education program receive pay
Chapman College, Orange, California	District provides full-time supervision for each 10-12 interns
Immaculate Heart College, Los Angeles, California	Summer sessions following B.A. - used to complete course requirements - interviewing year is full-salary-full-time internship
Mount St. Mary's College, Los Angeles, California	Elementary for degreed students
Pepperdine College, Los Angeles, California	Intern one year - complete 30 unit postgraduate requirements
San Francisco College for Women, San Francisco, California	Only best students are allowed to enter on an internship program - one year
San Francisco State College, San Francisco, California	Only at the request of a specific school district for a specific student

INSTITUTION	PROGRAM
San Fernando Valley State College, Northridge, California	Requires completion of all credential courses in Education and one 4-unit assignment of student teaching prior to intern assignment
San Jose State College, San Jose, California	Internship
Stanislaus State College, Turlock, California	Student teaching during academic year and one summer session and one year teaching
St. Joseph College, Orange, California	Two years of supervised teaching under the direction of a master teacher
University of the Pacific, Stockton, California	Secondary and elementary - summer school, academic year, and followed by involvement with pupils - some theory, full teacher level during year with close supervision by school and university
University of Santa Clara, Santa Clara, California	Mathematics
Colorado College, Colorado Springs, Colorado	A M.A.T. in elementary school teaching
Colorado State College, Greeley, Colorado	Undergraduate intern program full or part time
University of Denver, Denver, Colorado	Graduate level only
Central Connecticut State College, New Britain, Connecticut	Cadet teaching--teachers paid for their services and receiving supervision from the college to meet student teaching requirements
Fairfield University, Fairfield, Connecticut	For administrators in training
University of Connecticut, Storrs, Connecticut	Some students internship in special education

INSTITUTION	PROGRAM
Western Connecticut State College, Danbury, Connecticut	Intensive program for college graduates
American University, Washington, D.C.	Internships in teaching, guidance, and counseling - special education offered to master degree students
Howard University, Washington, D.C.	M.A.T. M.A. for teachers of disadvantaged children
Florida A & M University, Tallahassee, Florida	Administrative internship as a principal at the elementary or secondary level supported by funds from a foundation
Florida Southern College, Lakeland, Florida	Same as student teaching
University of Miami, Coral Gables, Florida	Graduate doctoral internships in all areas
Emary University, Altanta, Georgia	M.A. in teaching - paid ½ year internship
Georgia State College, Atlanta, Georgia	Students who have had less than three years experience as teachers must have internship as part of the masters degree
Mercer University, Macon, Georgia	Reading specialist
West Georgia College, Carrollton, Georgia	Student teaching regarded as internship
Tolentine College, Olympia Fields, Illinois	Become teachers when they finish their Theology courses and in many cases have their masters degree in their field - learn through practicums in this period
University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois	For M.A.T. candidates
Ball State University, Muncie, Indiana	Graduate programs in special areas
Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana	Interns teaching on a semester basis after an integrated methods and student teaching experience

INSTITUTION	PROGRAM
University of Notre Dame, Notre Dame, Indiana	One semester full-time, half year pay as part of M.A.T. program
St. Joseph's College, Rensselaer, Indiana	For experimental teachers who have had 5 or more years of classroom experience
Valparaiso University, Valparaiso, Indiana	Four graduate students are in a fellowship program but student teaching is same as undergraduate
Central College, Pella, Iowa	4th and 5th year program of internship, summer school is used for some of the academic or professional course work
Morningside College, Sioux City, Iowa	One semester with three-fourths pay
Parsons College, Fairfield, Iowa	Wisconsin type plan on an experimental basis with one school system
Westmar College, Le Mars, Iowa	A program for graduates to complete education courses while teachin under supervisors
Kansas State University, Manhattan, Kansas	Students have bachelors degrees and spend one semester doing student teaching - inexperienced teacher fellowship program
Washburn University, Topeka, Kansas	Elementary principal internship
Cathernine Spalding College, Louisville, Kentucky	Eight men in an internship program at local school
Nazareth College, Nazareth, Kentucky	Internship for one year
University of Louisville, Louisville, Kentucky	Uncertified teachers on full salary receive a minimum of supervision and student teaching credit in return for their tuition
Ursuline College, Louisville, Kentucky	Only persons with a degree and a certificate with a professional commitment are eligible

INSTITUTION	PROGRAM
Nicholls State College, Thibodaux, Louisiana	Elementary internship program at the undergraduate level
Xavier University, New Orleans, Louisiana	National Teachers Corp Program
University of Maine, Orono, Maine	M.A.T. program
Goucher College, Towson, Maryland	Graduate program for liberal arts graduates preparing to teach grades 1-6. A 4-week pre-session and a 1st semester precede the 2nd semester internship. Paid, independent teaching assignment supervised by coordinator in school system
Maryland Institute, Baltimore, Maryland	Graduate internship
University of Maryland, College Park, Maryland	Guidance, administration students
Boston College, Chestnut Hill, Massachusetts	M.A.T. - M.S.T. full year - ½ time for 6 semester hours of credit intern paid $2500.00
Boston University, Boston, Massachusetts	Two science teachers who teach a semester - each will complete M.A. in 2 summers and 2 semester programs
College of Boston, Boston, Massachusetts	4 graduate students in Boston Public Schools - receive ½ year salary and attend grad courses the other half
Northeastern University, Boston, Massachusetts	About 25% of students have prior paid positions as teacher aides
Smith College, Northampton, Massachusetts	Summer secondary
Tufts University, Medford, Massachusetts	For teachers of emotionally disturbed and physically handicapped
Hillsdale College, Hillsdale, Michigan	Participate in the Twin Valley Community Learning Program at Coldwater

INSTITUTION	PROGRAM
Marygrove College, Detroit, Michigan	Reading Fellowship Program
Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan	Elementary only - 5 academic years - intern year supervised by an intern consultant at ratio of one consultant to 5 interns
University of Michigan, Michigan	Teachers who have not received a teaching certificate and are observed in their own class
College of St. Thomas, St. Paul, Minnesota	M.A.T. internships for 2 semesters
Macalester College, St. Paul, Minnesota	For M. Ed. students without student teaching
Mankato State College, Mankato, Minnesota	M.A.T.
State College, St. Cloud, Minnesota	Residency in teaching because it takes place during first year of regular teaching and after completion of regular B.S. teaching program and full certification
Fontbonne College, Clayton 5, Missouri	Special education
Washington University, St. Louis, Missouri	M.A.T. program for students with B.A. in subject area. Begins with summer school student teaching - one semester on campus with full graduate academic load, one semester as intern
Eastern Montana College, Billings, Montana	Pilot program at the present time - this is a fourth year undergraduate program, all of the fourth year is spent in school situation
University of Montana, Missoula, Montana	For administrators and counselors
Creighton, Omaha, Nebraska	Teacher aide program - elementary act for 2-3 hours a week with teacher
University of New Hampshire, Durham, New Hampshire	M.A.T. program for both elementary and secondary

INSTITUTION	PROGRAM
Fairleigh Dickinson University, Rutherford, New Jersey	M.A.T.
Georgian Court College, Lakewood, New Jersey	In-service supervised teaching program required for state certification - teachers under contract elementary or secondary take 2 semesters and evening seminar
Jersey City State College, Jersey City, New Jersey	M.A.T. and supervised seminar in teaching
Rider College, Trenton, New Jersey	A small graduate internship program
Trenton State College, Trenton, New Jersey	M.A.T. program in which students do 9 weeks of student teaching under a cooperating teacher (not the usual paid internship)
Westminster Choir College, Princeton, New Jersey	Two in-service teachers conduct interview, observe teaching, require lesson planning, and evaluations
Eastern New Mexico University, Portoles, New Mexico	Ed. S. ($2400.00 stipend)
New Mexico State University, Las Cruces, New Mexico	Participate in Teacher Corps Program
University of New Mexico, Albuquerque, New Mexico	Outstanding junior student teachers are given their own classrooms as seniors. The cooperating school systems pay these students a $1,000.00 stipend and we pay the senior year tuition
Adelphi University, Garden City, New York	Provisionally certified teachers during their first year of teaching may elect an internship course which meets 2 hours per week on campus in the evening. A member of the Education Department assists the principal at the school for supervision of the new teacher

INSTITUTION	PROGRAM
City College, New York, New York	Liberal arts grads taking a M.S. in Education and internship at the same time
Colgate University, Hamilton, New York	M.A.T. program for recent liberal arts graduates in the secondary fields of English, social studies, romance languages, mathematics, and science
Cornell University, Ithaca, New York	M.A.T. - 2 terms and a summer
Columbia University, New York, New York	A fifth year program that is not unlike our student teaching except the intern is a half-time, half-paid school employee
Hofstra University, Hempstead, New York	None in secondary education - special education - educational administration-educational psychology
Manhattanville College, Purchase, New York	A part of the Master of Arts in Teaching program at the college, there is a team internship program - teams consist of two elementary or secondary interns one of whom teaches full-time each semester, and one of whom assists two days per week in the same classroom
Manhattan School of Music, New York, New York	Internship in study leading to certification as Curriculum Administrator in Music
New York State University, Buffalo, New York	Part of a program for urban education for preparation of teachers for core schools
New York University, New York, New York	Teacher Corps program for returned Peace Corps volunteers - graduate: administrative interns
Niagara University, New York	Student is assigned to an area school for 10 weeks full-time
Pratt, Brooklyn, New York	Graduate M.S. students only

INSTITUTION	PROGRAM
Queens College, Flushing, New York	Only on graduate level
State University of New York, Albany, New York	Grad. M.A. - M.S. program - one summer and one year - intern full-time one semester - paid by local school board, $2,000.00
State University of New York, Buffalo, New York	A program is a core junior high school
State University of New York, Cortland, New York	Program in secondary English
State University College, Fredonia, New York	Secondary English program and a Nursery school through third grade program being instituted this year - M.A.T. in elementary education next year
State University College, Brockport, New York	11 students who are graduates are placed in an off-campus center for student teaching and professional courses for the entire year
State University College, Oswego, New York	Interns receive $1500 for one half year teaching - supervision is supplied by both school ane college (about 8 enrolled now)
Syracuse University, Syracuse, New York	Internship program is part of the previously funded Urban Teacher Preparation Program
Appalachian State University, Boone, North Carolina	Internship in Educational Administration - internship for supervising teachers - internship for guidance
Duke University, Durham, North Carolina	M.A.T. program
Elon College, Elon College, North Carolina	Work under supervision of qualified public school supervisor full day for eight weeks
North Carolina College, Durham, North Carolina	Experienced teacher fellowship program in educational media

INSTITUTION	PROGRAM
University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, North Carolina	5th year program for liberal arts to secondary - 6th year program for liberal arts grad. to elementary teaching
University of North Carolina, Greensboro, North Carolina	M.A.T. program. Designed for those wishing to go into English, social studies, math, and science
Mary College, Bismarck, North Dakota	Nurses (physiciatric)
N.O.S.U., Fargo, North Dakota	Educational Administration for school administration - counseling and guidance procticum
Antioch College, Yellow Springs, Ohio	M.A.T. in secondary, social studies, internships in Washington, D.C., Philadelphia, Penn., and Ohio
Ashland College, Ashland, Ohio	Pilot study this year - credit awarded in June
Case-Western Reserve University, Cleveland, Ohio	Graduate level in guidance and school psychology
Cleveland State University, Cleveland, Ohio	Internship program
College of Wooster, Wooster, Ohio	M.A.T. program - require one semester internship for all candidates except experienced teachers
Hiram College, Hiram, Ohio	Intern capacity for each teacher candidate - may last for anywhere from 1 qtr. to 2 years - elementary candidate may elect 5 year program including student teaching in school accepting intern at partial pay
John Carroll University, Cleveland, Ohio	M.A.T. programs and a small number of carefully supervised student teacher interns
Oberlin College, Oberlin, Ohio	Elementary- last year of M.A.T. curriculum, full-time, full-pay (preceded by student teaching in 5th yr.) Secondary- one semester, full-time, full-pay (during one year program)

INSTITUTION	PROGRAM
University of Akron, Akron, Ohio	Teacher Corps Project
University of Cincinnati, Cincinnati, Ohio	Graduate students
Xavier University, Cincinnati, Ohio	Graduate students in full-time teaching who must acquire student teaching credit
University of Oklahoma, Norman, Oklahoma	Administrative internships in higher education, special education, counseling, and guidance
Lewis and Clark College, Portland, Oregon	M.A.T. - 5th year requirements aimed at B.A. with or without previous professional course work
Linfield College, McMinnville, Oregon	Teach ½ time in schools on half salary-attend 2 summer schools and a school year - get M.A. and certificate
Oregon College of Education, Monmouth, Oregon	For all who have completed work except student teaching - earn 21 credit hours during year plus two-thirds of a beginning teacher's salary
Portland State College, Portland, Oregon	For selected students only
Southern Oregon College, Ashland, Oregon	Elementary only - two interns team with one regular teacher in operation of two classrooms
University of Oregon, Eugene, Oregon	Elementary/secondary - 15 months - possible 6th year
Allegheny College, Meadville, Pennsylvania	Fifth year involves full-time, full-pay, intensively supervised internships and related courses. Summer before and after - part of M.A. program - geared to internship
Bucknell University, Lewisburg, Penn.	Only in elementary semester of practice teaching at half salary, plus professional education courses

INSTITUTION	PROGRAM
Indiana University, Indiana, Pennsylvania	Selected students are assigned for one semester internship without credit (elementary)
Millersville State College, Millersville, Pennsylvania	B.S. degree people in a paid experience and supervised
Philadelphia Musical Academy, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania	Student placed as beginning term substitute in Phila. public schools- 1 semester 5 days a week all day - receives 9 credit hours
Shippensburg State College, Shippensburg, Pennsylvania	Special cases for graduate school and certification
Ursinus College, Collegeville, Pennsylvania	Graduates of the institution who did not prepare to teach can be supervised on the job to receive student teaching credit and provisional certification
Washington & Jefferson College, Washington, Pennsylvania	Intern program the 1st semester of senior year- not paid intern program
West Chester State College, West Chester, Pennsylvania	For graduates who have A.B. and are certifying for teaching
Temple University, Phildelphia, Penn.	National Teacher Corps - M. Ed. - Primesite - El. El. - M. Ed. secondary internship ITPG - M. Ed.
Graduate School of Education, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania	One year M.S. summer, limited student teaching. Fall & spring half-time teaching in inner city school, half-time study at G.S. Ed. Course work in both ed. and major fields. Salary paid by school district of Philia - ½ starting salary for regular teacher
University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania	Too complicated to explain briefly. Write to Director if this is needed

INSTITUTION	PROGRAM
Brown University, Providence, Rhode Island	Graduate student in secondary school only
Rhode Island College, Providence, Rhode Island	Special education for grad students
Converse College, Spartanburg, South Carolina	M.A.T. program - secondary education- one full year in internship included- close supervision by college staff
South Carolina State College, Orangeburg, South Carolina	Graduate students in a prospective teacher's program
South Dakota State University, Brookings, South Dakota	One year as an intern in a public school
East Tennessee State University, Johnson City, Tennessee	Teacher Corps Program
Memphis State University, Memphis, Tennessee	Full-time teaching experience for one year - available for candidates for M.A.T. , secondary school
Sam Houston State College, Huntsville, Texas	School Administration
Sul Ross State College, Alpine, Texas	Administration program - 60 hours above the B.A. is required for this certificate - one semester is used for internship
Texas Technological College, Leebleack, Texas	On the advanced graduate level only
Brigham Young University, Prove, Utah	Undergraduate culminating. Some one semester, some two semester. Two-three students per master teacher. Some working as teams. Approximately one-half salary
Utah State University, Logan, Utah	Very limited
Weber State College, Ogden, Utah	Student receives ¼ of beginning teachers salary, goes for a full year of for ½ year - summer clinic on micro teaching and special workshops

INSTITUTION	PROGRAM
Lyndon State College, Lyndonville, Vermont	Pilot program - students completed college work - paid three-fourths salary-weekly seminars on campus - weekly visits by supervisor from college
University of Vermont, Vermont	Six students on a so-called English internship - Prospective Teacher Federal Fund Program
Presbyterian School of Christian Education, Richmond, Virginia	Offer two graduate teaching fellowships
University of Virginia, Charlottesville, Virginia	One year fellowship program at the University followed by a full year of internship, teaching four classes - two summers with full year of internship between, teaching three classes and taking one course each semester
Virginia State College, Petersburg, Virginia	M.A.T.
University of Washington, Seattle, Washington	Administrative interns
Washington State University, Pullman, Washington	Only for school administrators - principals and superintendent credentials
Whitworth College, Spokane, Wash.	Elementary and secondary principal credentials
West Virginia Wesleyan College, Buckhannon, West Virginia	Students assist teachers in classroom two hours per week in methods courses
West Virginia University, Morgantown, West Virginia	Limited beginning - six student teachers
Marquette University, Milwaukee, Wisconsin	Students with B.S. degree and 2.5 G.P.A. For secondary, area of need - English, Math, Science. Program tailored to background and training of student toward certification

INSTITUTION	PROGRAM
University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wisconsin	Internship program in both elementary and secondary for certification and M.A. degree - full time internship for qualified undergrads and grads
Viterbo College, La Crosse, Wisconsin	One intern this semester. We cooperate with the University of Wisconsin in this program
Wisconsin State University, Oshkosh, Wisconsin	Undergraduate internship
Wisconsin State University, Whitewater, Wisconsin	WIP program (in cooperation with University of Wisconsin and other state universities)
Wisconsin State University, Superior, Wisconsin	Full-time for semester - $1200 contract - certified by state - cooperative program for state university
Wisconsin State University, Platteville, Wisconsin	One semester paid internship($1200) is available to M.A.T. students and students doing internship in culturally handicapped areas only. All other student teaching in usual manner
Wisconsin State University, Stevens Point, Wisconsin	Work with the University of Wisconsin and other state universities. Program calls for a one week summer workshop, the September experience of a 40-50% full teaching responsibility plus work under a cooperating teacher - stipend is $1200 for the semester - to be raised to $1500 next year
Wisconsin State University, La Crosse, Wisconsin	Replaces student teaching for seniors - only excellent students involved, less than 5% of eligible candidates
Wisconsin State University, River Falls, Wisconsin	Graduate and honors undergraduate program in cooperation with University of Wisconsin and the other state universities

THE USE OF GRADUATE STUDENTS TO SUPERVISE STUDENT TEACHERS

Supplemental Report No. 4

Dr. James A. Johnson
Northern Illinois University
DeKalb, Illinois

8 July, 1968

NOTE: This report is intended to supplement the final report of A NATIONAL SURVEY OF STUDENT TEACHING PROGRAMS which was conducted under a grant from the U.S. Office of Education (Grant No. OEG 3-7-068182-2635). In this survey, a rather lengthy questionnaire was sent to each of the 1,110 teacher preparing institutions in the United States. Returns were received from 847 (or 76%) of these institutions. The final report just mentioned presents the general findings of this survey; however, this supplemental report elaborates upon the findings of questionnaire item No. 30 which asked, "Do you employ graduate students to supervise student teachers? ☐ Yes ☐ No. If Yes, approximately what per cent of your total student teaching supervision is done by graduate students rather than by regular faculty members?" Nine per cent of the respondents answered Yes to this question. This supplemental report lists each of these schools and show the per cent of their total student teaching supervision that is done by graduate students.

INSTITUTION	PERCENTAGE
Tuskegee Institution, Tuskegee, Alabama	2%
University of Alabama, University, Alabama	50%
Arizona State University, Tempe, Arizona	28%
University of Arkansas, Fayetteville, Arkansas	10%
Claremont Graduate School, Claremont, California	90%
St. Joseph College, Orange, California	80%
University of Southern California, Los Angeles, California	10%
University of the Pacific, Stockton, California	10%
Colorado State College, Greeley, Colorado	20%
University of Colorado, Boulder, Colorado	30%
University of Denver, Denver, Colorado	40%
Hartford Seminary Foundation, Hartford, Conneticut	5%
University of Connecticut, Storrs, Conneticut	10%
University of Florida, Gainesville, Florida	10%
University of Miami, Coral Gables, Florida	3%
Emary University, Altanta, Georgia	10%
The University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois	10%
University of Illinois, Urbana, Illinois	70%
Ball State University, Muncie, Indiana	10%
Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana	50%
University of Notre Dame, Notre Dame, Indiana	10%
University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa	70%

INSTITUTION	PERCENTAGE
The University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kansas	60%
University of Maine, Orono, Maine	20%
University of Maryland, College Park, Maryland	10%
Boston College, Chestnut Hill, Massachusetts	70%
Boston University, Boston, Massachusetts	40%
Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan	10%
Wayne State University, Detroit, Michigan	65%
University of Mississippi, University, Mississippi	20%
St. Louis University, St. Louis, Missouri	70%
University of Missouri, Columbia, Missouri	10%
Washington University, St. Louis, Missouri	60%
Montana State University, Bozeman, Montana	10%
University of Montana, Missoula, Montana	5%
University of Nebraska, Lincoln, Nebraska	21%
University of New Mexico, Albuquerque, New Mexico	25%
City College, New York, New York	5%
Columbia University, Teachers College, New York, New York	8%
Cornell University, Ithaca, New York, New York	50%
New York State University at Buffalo, Buffalo, New York	90%
New York University, New York, New York	7%
State University of New York at Buffalo, New York	90%
State University College at Fredonia, Fredonia, New York	50%

INSTITUTION	PERCENTAGE
Syracuse University, Syracuse, New York	50%
University of Rochester, Rochester, New York	50%
Duke University, Durham, North Carolina	20%
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Chapel Hill, North Carolina	2%
University of North Carolina at Greensboro, Greensboro, North Carolina	10%
University of North Dakota, Grand Forks, North Dakota	30%
Walsh College, Canton, Ohio	10%
Kent State University, Kent, Ohio	1%
Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio	52%
Ohio University, Athens, Ohio	
University of Cincinnati, Cincinnati, Ohio	14%
University of Toledo, Toledo, Ohio	25%
University of Oklahoma, Norman, Oklahoma	18%
University of Tulsa, Tulsa, Oklahoma	1%
University of Oregon, Eugene, Oregon	50%
Pennsylvania State University, University Park, Pennsylvania	50%
Temple University, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania	40%
University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania	10%
University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania	5%
University of South Carolina, Columbia, South Carolina	20%

INSTITUTION	PERCENTAGE
University of South Dakota, Vermillion, South Dakota	
East Tennessee State University, Johnson City, Tennessee	
University of Tennessee, Knoxville, Tennessee	10%
Baylor University, Waco, Texas	
Texas A & I University, Kengsville, Texas	10%
The University of Texas, Austin, Texas	50%
University of Houston, Houston, Texas	20%
Brigham Young University, Prove, Utah	1%
University of Utah, Salt Lake City, Utah	30%
Utah State University, Logan, Utah	60%
University of Vermont, Vermont	2%
University of Virginia, Charlottesville, Virginia	50%
University of Washington, Seattle, Washington	20%
West Virginia University, Morgantown, West Virginia	5%
University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wisconsin	60%
University of Wyoming, Laramie, Wyoming	5%